Losing Utopia?
A Study of British and Japanese Utopian Novels in the Face of Postmodern Consciousness

Yoriko Moichi

PhD in Comparative Literature

A Thesis Presented to
the University of Edinburgh
2006

I declare that the thesis is the result of my own work, has been composed by myself, and has not been submitted for any degree or professional qualification other than the degree for which I am now a candidate.

Date.01/03/2006 Signature.....

Abstract

A reflection upon the historical events in the twentieth century provides a crisis about the *raison d'être* of utopian thought as well as utopian literature. Since Plato's *Republic*, utopianists have aimed to describe how the best state of a commonwealth actually works in practice. Since the era of the Enlightenment, the intellectual and spiritual dreams for both the best pattern of life and an ideal framework of community have been endorsed through the notions of human perfectibility, rationality, universality and progress. Yet, the historical events of the twentieth century marked a scepticism towards utopia insofar as a society based on the values of unity and totalised system rather than individual freedom was deemed as less humane and, at worst, a model of totalitarian regime. This critical view of conventional utopia is strengthened in postmodern social and cultural debates. Postmodernists' "incredulity toward metanarratives" (Lyotard) and their political philosophies about difference and diversity endanger the "end of utopia", challenging the teleology of utopian discourse itself which provides a blueprint of a perfectly constructed, ahistorical community.

However, contemporary writers do not cease to create both utopian and dystopian novels. This thesis analyses six novels of British and Japanese utopian literature and considers how the writers explore forms and themes in the face of postmodern consciousness. (In this thesis "utopian literature" embraces "dystopian literature" as its subgenre.)

The novels discussed in this thesis are: George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* (1962), Alasdair Gray's *Lanark* (1981), Abe Kobo's *Inter Ice Age 4* (1959), Inoue Hisashi's *Kirikirijin* (1981), and Murakami Haruki's *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* (1985). Undoubtedly, Orwell's text is one of the most important dystopian novels in the twentieth century. Yet the "paradox" of his novel reveals vulnerability in the sense that the author, although he is critical of totalitarianism and aware of its affinity with traditional utopia's concepts of totality and universality, ultimately relies on the ideas of totality and transcendental meta-language in the pursuit of his intellectual mission. Burgess attempts to negate the "optimism" seen in previous major utopian and dystopian narratives. He also particularly questions the degree of universality, wondering where to find the consensus in order to build up a society that satisfies everybody. In Gray's novel dystopia is no longer illustrated as a warning; dystopia is now depicted as reality. Additionally, the novel highlights a "process" towards utopia rather than the final image of ideal place, thereby suggesting that the achievement of utopia is always *deferred*. Abe's novel brings the concept of the everyday into utopian literature. His deconstructed notion of the everyday offers a future far removed from our expectation and imagination. Inoue's novel manifests the possibility of creating a downsized, egalitarian utopia. This small utopian community is envisaged for those who have been marginalised in the process of Japan's economical development. Murakami's novel explores utopia in the cultural styles of advanced capitalism. In his fiction, utopia is associated with a spiritual fortress located in the mind; yet this does not mean the preference for a private world but rather implies a new viewpoint about the relationship between the individual and society.

The juxtaposition of these novels in this comparative study aims to construe the signs which the six novels show in their direction for the future of utopian literature.

The world process has not yet been won anywhere, but it has not been thwarted anywhere, and human beings can be on earth the indicators of their decisive way toward salvation that has not yet come or toward damnation that has also not yet come. The world remains in its entirety the same highly labouring laboratory *possibilis salutis*....Hercules says: "Whoever does not hope for the unhoped-for will not find it".

—Ernst Bloch

This thesis is dedicated to the memory of my father Masafumi Moichi
and Professor Dietrich F. G. Scheunemann

Acknowledgments

Completion of this thesis would not have been achieved without many people's encouragement and support, directly and indirectly.

Firstly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the Rotary Foundation and the University of Edinburgh for their financial support, without which this thesis would not have possible. I would also like to give particular thanks for access to their reading and other materials to the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh, the British Library, and the Library of SOAS (the School of Oriental and African Studies), London. Also, my research on the reviews and articles on Murakami Haruki owes a lot to the generous support of the librarians at the National Library of Scotland.

I wish to express my sincere thanks to my principal supervisor, the late Professor Dietrich F.G. Scheunemann, for giving me constant encouragement and generous support throughout the development of this dissertation. I am also very grateful to Professor John Frow of the University of Edinburgh for allowing me to join his inspiring classes. I also thank the following people for their support and encouragement: Professor Lyman T. Sargent, Professor Keiko Izubuchi, Dr John Lee, and Professor Kohei Kawashima.

Finally, I wish to give thanks to following people for their help in getting this thesis completed and for spiritual support through the time it has taken: my family and my friends—in particular, Ms Serena Field, Dr Jean-Louis Hudry, Dr David Prickett, Dr Marianne Czisnik, and Dr John McWilliams.

All errors of fact and interpretation are the responsibility of the author.

Abbreviations

CEJL	*The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters*
CWGO	*Complete Works of George Orwell*
HWEW	*Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World*
IIA4	*Inter Ice Age 4*
1984	*Nineteen Eighty-Four*
2004	*A Clockwork Orange 2004*

Contents

Introduction

In the era of postmodernism, utopian thought, along with utopian novels, is radically called into question. Over centuries, people have dreamt of utopia for the sake of happiness; utopia is the ideal place in which human, social and political problems and predicaments are solved. Since Plato's *Republic*, there have been many attempts to demonstrate how an ideal, perfect community works; and Thomas More coined the term "utopia", and his *Utopia* (1516) established the literary genre for all writings that seek an ideal place. Since then, a number of utopian novels have been produced until now.

Regardless of its long history and tradition, the *raison d'être* of this literary genre is now at stake. Indeed, postmodernism challenges the project of constructing utopias. Krishan Kumar in *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times* (1987) speaks of the "twilight" of utopia; and he wonders: "Can there be anything more commonplace than the pronouncement that, in the twentieth-century, utopia is dead—and dead beyond any hope of resurrection?" (380) His statement implies the decline of utopian literature, meaning that contemporary utopian writings tend to confine themselves to a "restricted" aim and "modest" ambition. Thus he reaches the conclusion that today's utopian writers no longer visualise "a whole society ordered according to some principle of rightness or goodness" (420). The loss of vitality in contemporary utopian literature, as discussed by Kumar, is to some extent connected to the current political and philosophical debates about the "end of ideology".[1] Russell Jacoby's *The End of Utopia* (1999) analyses the decline of the utopian vision in terms of the historical events of the twentieth century, such as the end of the Cold War and the fall of the Berlin Wall, which mark the end of an era through which it is more and more difficult to defend absolute ideas in politics and morality. Jacoby believes that utopia should exist as "a precondition for humanity to advance to a new

---

[1] Cf. Gregory C. Vieira's "No Place for Utopia: Postmodern Theory and *The White Hotel*" (1993) and Judith Shklar's *After Utopia: The Decline of Political Faith* (1957).

and humane culture" (27), but is very conscious of the great difficulties in defining and defending a utopian thought in today's social and political polemics.

A postmodern consciousness insists on "the end of utopia".[2] Postmodernism stands for a cultural sensibility which aims to demystify beliefs that legislate over eternal truth and universal reason. It stems from a reflection upon the historical events of the twentieth and twentieth-first centuries (e.g. the two world wars, the rise of fascism and militarism, the atomic bomb, the end of the Cold War, the increase of terrorism), which leads it to doubt the Western social and political models, as through rationality could be the unique source of emancipation for all humanity. A postmodern mood implies uncertainty and ambiguity. Thus, the French philosopher Jean-François Lyotard (1985), one of the pioneers of this cultural and philosophical mode, assesses the Western concept of humanity through disheartening historical events, and writes: "Following Theodor Adorno, I have used the name 'Auschwitz' to signify just how impoverished recent Western history seems from the point of view of the 'modern' project of the emancipation of humanity" (48). Lyotard's reference to "the modern" stands for the age of Enlightenment in the eighteenth century.[3] In his *Postmodern Condition* (*La Condition postmoderne: rapport sur le savoir*) (1979), he doubts the rational, scientific, technological and political projects of "the modern conception" as defined by the age of the Enlightenment. In turn, he describes the primary feature of postmodernism as "incredulity toward metanarratives", and claims the absence of ultimate truth among all "*grand récits*" from which any consensual validation of judgements can be traced. Lyotard's position negates the grand narratives and insists on the notion of difference; his view is based on a neo-Wittgensteinian language theory which argues that there is no longer unity of language but "islets" of language, namely, each language is governed

---

[2] Cf. Perry Anderson's "The River of Time" in the *New Left Review* 26 (2004).

[3] The term "postmodernism" in this thesis is anti-modern in the sense that it is critical of rational thoughts derived from the age of Enlightenment. Postmodern novels are by no means opposed to those of Modernism; they rather follow literary techniques and themes from the writers of Modernism, except that postmodern writers have no confidence in the concepts of totality and universality. See Brian McHale's *Constructing Postmodernism* (1992) and Randal Stevenson's "Alasdair Gray and the Postmodern" (1991).

by a local system that is "untranslatable" into the languages of other systems. A liberating politics of difference and diversity is defined by Lyotard as the essential characteristic of postmodern consciousness: it not only refutes the possibility that the Western world can be viewed as the model for all humanity, but mainly develops a critical approach against any arguments which attempt to totalise, coercively and normatively, the genuinely heterogeneous.

Utopian discourse embodies faith in human rationality, perfection, totality, and unity.[4] The common root of utopian vision is, according to Kumar, "a faith in human reason" (1987: 35). Reason is thought of as the ultimate guide to prevent any society from ignorance and corruption. Darko Suvin (1994) defines a utopian novel as "the verbal construction of a particular quasi-human community where socio-political institutions, norms and individual relationships are [organised] according to a more perfect principle than in the author's community" (6). Utopia presents a perfect and static place, in which any change is deemed to be unnecessary. Therefore, utopian novels demonstrate "the good pattern of life in an ahistorical cosmos" (Olson 143), and the perfect social framework is believed to fulfil and satisfy the happiness of its members. The role of the author is to guide readers towards idealised social conditions with perfect morality; this is part of the Enlightenment project which defines the optimistic belief that the use of reason leads human beings to perfection.[5]

The making of a text which serves as a guide to the best action and happiness is questioned by postmodernist critics. Zygmunt Bauman (1987) refutes all attempts to appeal to universal definitions which would be valid in any place at any time. As he argues, "[The] two-centuries-old philosophical voyage to certainty and universal criteria of perfection and 'good-life' seems to be wasted effort" (qtd. in McLennan 341). Dick Hebdige (1988) argues that postmodernism is the antithesis of "utopia, totalisation and teleology", and rejects "the Enlightenment project which is defined as a twofold impetus towards universalisation (reason) and social engineering

---

[4] Cf. Tom Moylan's *Scraps of the Untainted Sky* (2000).

[5] Kumar, among others, states that the author is "just as the hidden God, who will always remain hidden, provokes us to try to uncover the veil, to discover perfect truth and perfect morality" (1981: 3).

(revolution), both of which find support and legitimacy in the related doctrines of progress, social planning and historical 'necessity'" (197).[6] The rational concepts of the Enlightenment are unable to take into account diversity and difference expressed by marginalised communities and individuals. There is a direct contradiction between rational definitions (implying the mastery of nature, the control of social forms, the perfect state of being, etc.) and a postmodern scepticism which claims that the particular is not reducible to the universal. The teleological discourses of utopian literature is called into question, insofar as it is illusory and contradictory to offer the rational, universal and permanent blueprint of both social harmony and individual fulfilment. Leszek Kolakowski (1983) criticises the idea of perfect harmony, since it ignores the complex relationships among individuals. He thinks of diversity as a prerequisite for human life. As he puts it:

> A feasible utopian world must presuppose that people have lost their creativity and freedom, that the variety of human life forms and thus the personal life have been destroyed, and that all of mankind has achieved the perfect satisfaction of needs and accepted a perpetual deadly stagnation as its normal condition. Such a world would mark the end of the human race as we know it and as we define it. (90)

In other words, the depiction of a blueprint for the future is deemed to be totalitarian, since the idea of a unique future neglects the diversity and difference of infinitely many possibilities. Some writes go even further by making a direct connection between utopia and despotic regimes. David Morley and Kevin Robins (1996) hold the similarity between the effect of utopian discourse and those of such big concepts as "God" and "history" which succeed in creating despotism:

> The problem, it is argued, is that once you set out on this road, fortified by notions like having "God" or "history" on your side, convinced that you have a mission to lead people towards some promised land, what actually happens is that you turn into Robespierre or Pol Pot and that, in your conviction of your

---

[6] Hebdige describes the characteristic of the postmodern consciousness as "a vein of scepticism concerning any collective destination, global framework of prediction, any claims to envisage, for instance, the 'ultimate mastery of nature', the 'rational control of social forms', a 'perfect state of being', 'end of all (oppressive) powers" (1988: 96).

> revolutionary rightness, you end up instigating a terroristic process, justifying the elimination of your enemies by reference to the ultimate justice of your goal and the rightness of your cause. (60)

Yet, their argument simplistically combines historical facts with some social theories represented by utopian writers. Such argument as Morley's focuses on the results of disgraceful human actions and blames utopian thoughts, along with utopian novels, for their mistakes. This approach seems to reverse the proceeding order of examination and, moreover, does not fully elucidate the process in which a conceptual *telos* is used as an argument for the historical foundation of a totalitarian regime.

Negative views of utopia have already been suggested by philosophers and theoreticians after the end of the First World War.[7] This is not very surprising, insofar as the horrors of wars were viewed as the consequence of a rationalisation of societies through ideologies. Kumar (1987) writes:

> With the failure of the great utopian experiments of modern times, with all the other bloody episodes of the twentieth century—world war, fascism, the Holocaust, Hiroshima—what can possibly sustain utopian thought? And even if utopia can maintain some sort of existence, what might its functions be? At the beginning, with More, utopia set out an agenda for the modern world. Today, five-hundred years later, what are the uses of utopia? (85)

Isaiah Berlin in *The Crooked Timber of Humanity: Chapters in the History of Ideas* (1959) mentions the decline of utopian thought. His contention is that making a perfect and complete society based on the assumption of "certain fixed, unaltering nature, certain universal, common, immutable goals" is undesirable (20). Utopia fails to define a place for the individual and loses itself in its everlasting search for an absolute rationality which admits no exception. This rational logic leads to a historical totalitarianism. Likewise, Karl Popper (1945) criticises the idea of a rational blueprint describing an ideal future, since it implies an exclusive and authoritarian political viewpoint which does not allow for any alternative ways of

---

[7] Some intellectuals in the 1930s criticise a totalitarian system by referring to Plato's writing. See R.H.S. Crossman's *Plato To-day* (1937) and W. Fite's *The Platonic Legend* (1934).

thinking. In this sense, utopia is directly opposed to an "open society", i.e. a pluralistic society based on liberty and tolerance. One of the most influential views against utopianism pertains to *Dialectic of Enlightenment* written by Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer (1944). The two philosophers reassess the Enlightenment by describing "a system of domination" which excludes any possible alternatives. The definition of an *a priori* "abstract power" destroys individualities, in the sense that individuals are the useful parts of a rational whole. Subjectivity becomes a mere instrument for the sake of an objective system.

A sceptical view of utopia has been developed by utopian writers themselves in the form of dystopia.[8] This constitutes a turning point in the history of utopian literature, insofar as utopia is questioned by its most fervent proponents. In other words, dystopia is the dark side of utopia, insisting on the logic of domination and oppression. Dystopian writers analyse the loss of humanity within systematised and controlled societies. Such a fear against a deprived autonomy is expressed through a pessimistic dystopia which directly contradicts the optimistic utopia.

We may then wonder whether utopia still exists in the face of postmodern consciousness. The answer is that the production of utopian (and not merely dystopian) novels has not ceased. This fact raises several questions. How do contemporary utopian writers deal with the current spiritual and social phenomenon, when at times it seems as though we have moved out of an age of uniformity, collectivity and universality into another one characterised by individuation, diversity and difference? Do utopian writers reflect this cultural and spiritual change and, if so, how? Or do they still maintain a desire to construct a world of uniformity? As far as the production of utopian novels has never ceased until now, the crucial question is not whether utopian thought, along with utopian novels, is compatible with the era of postmodernity; it is rather how writers explore their literary imagination by embarking on literary projects, such as forms, themes, subjects and methods of representation, in the face of postmodern consciousness.[9] Answers to

---

[8] A detailed account of dystopia is given in the first chapter of this thesis. As dystopia derives from utopia, this thesis defines dystopian novels as belonging to utopian literature.
[9] Cf. Ruth Levitas (1991).

these questions can be drawn from the assessment of several utopian and dystopian novels published in the second part of the twentieth century. This thesis will study six novels from Britain and Japan: George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* (1961), Alasdair Gray's *Lanark: A Life in Four Books* (1981), Abe Kobo's *Daiyon kanpyo-ki* (*Inter Ice Age Four*) (1959), Inoue Hisashi's *Kirikirijin* (*The Kirikirians*) (1981), and Murakami Haruki's *Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World: A Novel* (1985).[10]

Chapter one will analyse Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* that constitutes the perfect dystopia, understood as the negative mirror of utopia. The construction of a perfect State based on a rational order gives birth to an absolute totalitarianism. In this respect, Orwell paves the way for postmodernism by illustrating the "end of utopia" through its insight into the similarity between traditional utopias and a totalitarian system. Chapter two will argue about Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*, which develops a new style of dystopia. Burgess does not aim to provide the nightmarish picture of a totalitarian system, but defines a dystopia based on uncertainty through the absence of a clear-cut distinction between good and bad, right and wrong. Chapter three will focus on Gray's *Lanark: A Life in Four Books*, which will provide a new perspective for the construction of utopian literature because of its Scottish and postmodern characteristics. Chapter four will show that Abe's *Inter Ice Age Four* develops this literary genre based on his concept of everyday life and, in his text the future can never be subsumed under the present. Chapter five will study Inoue's *Kirikirijin*, which describes a small-scaled, egalitarian and agrarian utopian community. Finally, Chapter six will deal with Murakami's *Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World*, which illustrates how utopia can be preserved despite the power of global capitalism. In this novel, utopia now takes place within inner world, proper to individuals, and is explored in order to escape from the objective and ordering rules of the capitalistic societies.

---

[10] The names of the Japanese authors are given in the traditional order, i.e. the surnames come first. This thesis will refer to the English translations of the Japanese novels, except for Inoue's fiction which has not been translated into any languages.

Before studying these utopian and dystopian novels, the advantage of studying both British and Japanese novels should be noted. This thesis starts with the assumption that different cultural contexts will illuminate various facets of utopian literature. Japanese utopian novels are based on the "malleable" nature of Japanese culture: when ideas are introduced from overseas, they are deconstructed and extended through its regional context. The term "utopia" ("*yuutopia*") was first introduced in Japan at the end of the nineteenth century.[11] Yet, if Japan has imported utopian novels from the West, it has combined it with its own traditions, leading to the production of new forms of utopia and dystopia.

Accordingly, the three Japanese utopian and dystopian novels, studied in this thesis, may complement the Western definitions of utopia and dystopia. Yves Chevrel's *Comparative Literature Today* (1989) states that comparative literature is a testing hypothesis which illuminates "the work's previously unthought of possibilities" (1, 30). The "unthought" possibilities are born from the contact with another culture which supersedes the limited sphere of the "national" and "familiar". Chevrel writes: "To read, to bear, to see a foreign work in performance is to risk being confronted with words that initially were not addressed to the observer, to have to answer questions that have never been considered, that were previously of no concern" (13). We shall be confronted to this "risk", and we shall see how our understanding of utopia and dystopia can benefit from the comparison of writings coming from two distinct cultures. Chevrel concludes that a comparative literary study is "an intellectual procedure aimed at the study of any object with a claim to being literary by putting it in relation to other inherent elements of a culture" (1). The juxtaposition of different cultures will show that utopia in Japan has gained a new life, unlike utopia in Europe. In other words, the "twilight of utopia" might be an illusion drawn from the narrow context of the familiar Western concept of utopia.[12]

---

[11] Cf. Ihab Hassan's study of Japanese literature and culture (1996). Besides, Japanese words generally are romanised according to the system used in the standard *Kenkyuusha's New Japanese English Dictionary.*

[12] On the role of comparative studies in relation to the postmodern concepts of diversity and difference, see Gurbhagat Singh's "Futuristic Directions for Comparative Literature" (1991).

Some parts of this thesis have been already published in academic journals or presented at several conferences. A historical analysis of Japanese utopian literature is examined in my essay, "Japanese Utopian Literature from the 1870s to the Present and the Influence of Western Utopianism", published in *Utopian Studies: A Journal of the Society for Utopian Studies* (1999). Japan's valuation of utopian literature from the West was presented in a workshop at the School of Oriental and African Studies and the Institute of Commonwealth Studies, UCL, London (2003). The popularity of Murakami Haruki's novels has been explored in my essay, "On the Question of Cultural Identity in the Age of Globalisation", which was first presented at the Postgraduate Student Interdisciplinary Conference in East Asian Studies, University of Sheffield (March 2004). Its revised version has been published in *SEAS Electronic Working Papers* (University of Sheffield, 2004). Finally, a partial study of Alasdair Gray's *Lanark* was presented at the annual conference of the Society for Utopian Studies (2000) and at the conference of the English Literary Society of Japan (2005).

Chapter I
The Paradox of George Orwell's
Nineteen Eighty-Four

The tragic historical events of the twentieth century (including two world wars, militarism, fascism and the atomic bomb) shattered the human beliefs in constructing ideal places. As a result, British writers found difficulties in creating utopias and instead started describing "dystopia", namely, "an imaginary place or condition in which everything is as bad as possible" (*OED*). George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), among others, was of particular importance as one of the most distinguished dystopian novels ever published. The importance of this novel is ascribable to the author's indomitable criticism of totalitarian ideology as a system of ideas that necessarily manipulates and controls people's thought. It is also linked to Orwell's distrust of conventional forms of utopian literature, for the reason that the writers of this literary genre had expressed a monolithic and totalised view of life. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the author illustrates how human dreams, which had been envisaged in utopian literature, can lead to the opposite outcome in the form of totalitarianism. Through his depiction of an unwanted society, Orwell uncovers similarities between classical utopia and a totalitarian State. His critical approach to totalitarianism is interwoven with his insight into classical utopias.

The facts that Orwell's novel aims to attack totalitarianism, and that he abandoned classic utopias are crucial to considerations for analysis of the text. For, the author's anticipation sets the scene for the arguments explored by postmodern theorists in the latter part of the twentieth century. Under postmodern consciousness, the value of utopian literature is radically called into question for the sake of its inclination towards rational totalities and universal rules. As the negative mirror of utopia, Orwell's dystopia echoes a statement written by one of the leading postmodernists, Zygmunt Bauman (1987): "We suspect (even if we refuse to admit it) that the Holocaust could merely have uncovered another face of the same modern society whose other, so familiar, face we so admire. And that the two faces are

perfectly comfortably attached to the same body" (*Modernity and the Holocaust* 7). Through his portrayal of the radically developed totalitarian society, Orwell shatters any hope and faith in utopia. The influence and powerfulness of this novel is still unshakable, yet it needs to be considered why utopian and dystopian writers after the publication of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* have found it difficult to break through the prestige of this text.[1] The analysis of this text with this question will suggest both the strength and vulnerability of this powerful text, which this chapter aims to investigate.

This chapter will outline the main features of utopian literature and will show how dystopia constitutes the mirror and pessimistic vision of an intrinsically optimistic utopia. Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is the perfect instance of dystopia, insofar as the nightmarish society, ruled by Big Brother, represents a criticism against the rationality, completeness, and totality of utopia. Yet, we shall see that his novel still expresses a sense of totality, which suggests that dystopia is part of utopia in the sense that both imply the same postulate of systematic rationality. The final section of this chapter will examine the following paradox: dystopia is the negation of utopia, and yet both belong to the same literary genre.

FAREWELL TO UTOPIA

During his writing of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, in 1947, Orwell wrote in a letter to his friend Julian Symons that his next book was "a Utopia in the form of novel" (*CEJL* 4:536). We should not overlook this simple statement, since these words imply a more profound meaning than they might appear to. Orwell was certainly aware that his own work was part of a long tradition. Yet, the readers realise that, in Orwell's novel, the utopian society with a perfect social and political system is described in a distorted manner. The plot of his last novel is by no means intended to endorse the

---

[1] Krishan Kumar in his *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times* (1987) holds that Orwell's novel is the climax in the genre's history and states that no dystopian texts since his text "has truly captured the popular imagination or become the compelling image on the contemporary world" (422). The novel is the most celebrated work of "dystopia", "an imaginary place or condition in which everything is as bad as possible" as being in opposition to the state of utopia, "a place, state or condition ideally perfect in respect of politics, laws, customs, and conditions" (*OED*).

generally accepted positive meanings of "utopia". If the world of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a "utopia" as Orwell describes, then this is "about how people should live, about human nature, and the meaning and purpose of life" (Todd and Wheeler 2). Yet what the text shows us is the radically nightmarish image of a human world built on reason, and which places the power and stability of the society above the happiness of its members. In this respect, Orwell launched a new approach to classic utopian writing.

Until the beginning of the twentieth century, most of utopian writers have attempted to create an ideal community whose inhabitants live in perfect conditions. In most cases, writers have pictured ideal social visions as responses to their critical views pertaining to the actual societies of their times. The ideal society is the product of the author's critical analysis of his or her social reality; the author searches for the perfect social arrangements that will solve all problems in the real life. Plato's *Republic* shows what a society would be like if each individual carries out their own work in a rigidly framed hierarchical society. Thinking within a Christian framework, Thomas More in *Utopia* (1516) constructs a society through human virtues, such as justice, temperance and prudence. In Francis Bacon's *New Atlantis* (1627), the perfect world is constructed by means of technological productivity. Despite such diversity and variety in its themes and objects, utopia is, by definition, an ideal or flawless state, and utopian literature is a literary genre picturing such an ideal social vision.

As the titles of major classic utopias imply, utopia consists of the conscious design of a city or place.[2] It is the embodiment of reason as far as it is logically structured and ordered; utopia is also a static society in the sense that its perfect condition implies no necessity of developing or changing furthermore. To a great many writers, utopias are concerned with the happiness of individuals in society; yet, this sense of fulfilment for each habitant is assured by the security and safety of the

---

[2] On this point, Northrop Frye argues that the rise of utopia in the Renaissance is a logical outcome of the process of history: "It was inevitable that the utopia, as a literary genre, should be revived at the time of the Renaissance, the period in which the medieval social order was breaking down again into city-state units or nations governed from a capital city" (1965: 27).

society itself. State power and social stability are above the happiness of individual members. This tendency derives from the fact that the desire for utopia reappears through the human history as a recurring response to times of difficulty such as wars and famines. Therefore, in their reassessment of the organisation of life, utopian writers are more concerned with the safety of society than with the self-contentment of individuals. It is a shared belief among creators of utopia that the goal of society at large represents the wishes and dreams of the people within it. The perfect social arrangements are supposed to promise to each inhabitant both satisfaction and fulfilment, which is brought to the fore as the *telos* of society.

In this ideal vision, man is "essentially" what society is "essentially". Paul Tillich (1965) argues that the "positive" meaning of utopia is its "ontological truth": utopia expresses "man's essence, the inner aim of his existence" (296). In Tillich's view, as far as the ideal condition is related to a criticism against the status quo, the writer, who is the most sensitive representative, describes the common wish for other members with the aim at solving social problems of their society. Tillich argues then that "a socially defined utopia loses its truth if it does not at the same time fulfill the person, just as the individually defined utopia loses its truth if it does not at the same time bring fulfillment to society" (297). As well, in this model, such feelings as anguish, rage, disappointment and desire are important forces in inspiring the author's imagination and are shared by the readers in any place and at any time. Accordingly, the picture of a new ideal society exhibits the "truth" which corresponds to the readers' hidden hopes, anxieties and dreams. In this respect, the *telos* of creating utopia is to achieve "ontological truth" across time and space.

The perfect, flawless social conditions imagined by the writer, have a didactic purpose. Writers of utopia seek to present "the conviction that we are more than what our historical situation allows us to be, that we have not yet [realised] our full potential as human beings" (Ruppert 3). The utopian ideal shows what society would be like if actual societies were fully developed. Thus the ideal image of society suggests to readers that it would be possible to reach this perfect condition if they are conscious of our immanent power to transform reality. In this respect, the role of the

author in utopian writing is to offer "a standard of moral judgement" (Shklar 1965:105). Utopia as a human dream implies that autonomous hopes and desires are crystallised into society at large, yet, in doing so, it carefully guides us into the right path towards the ideal transformation of our actual life. The didactic nature of utopian literature is more striking when a shift of location takes place. Sébastien Mercier's *L'An Deux Mille Quatre Cent Quarante* (1770) is generally considered as the first work to locate utopia in the future. The introduction of this concept of time into utopian literature makes it possible to depict the perfect place in the future. Hence now utopia is not only "good place" but also "good time". Since then, a blueprint of the future in utopian literature emanates the idea that the future is the immanent of the present. With a belief in human perfection and perfectibility, utopian writers have pictured the future as the final goal of human progress. This teleological concept of utopia is integrated into the didactic nature of the authorship.

The nineteenth century witnesses a change in utopian literature. Imagining utopia now deals with the growth of capitalism which propels the exploitive division between capital and labour. According to Krishan Kumar (1987), it was not "the principles of progress themselves, but their use and practice... [that] dismayed and outraged [the contemporary writers]" (110). There arose a sense of crisis concerning the loss of human dignity and autonomy in the oppressed conditions of the working class. Some writers and philosophers take into consideration this social condition. As a logical and natural response to the rise of the technocracy and the exploitation of labour forces, their main concern is centred on "the curse of labour" (Todd and Wheeler 59), namely on the exploited condition of the working class, the wide-spread ugliness of the environment and industrial production, which reduce the beauty and uniqueness of individual life.

This conflict between individual autonomy and the power of capital become the main subject for the utopian writers of this time. Instead of suggesting that their world may take the shape of dystopia in the near future, utopian writers at this time still try to solve this problem by finding a compromise between human-centred systems and systems obliterating individual autonomy. In other words, the main

utopian texts of the nineteenth century are concerned with the fact that the state predominates over the individual; yet they still express and maintain the dream for utopia as a source of hope, a guide to action and the path to human happiness. This may be well seen in William Morris's and Edward Bellamy's novels. On the one hand, Bellamy's *Looking Backward* (1888) applauds the totalisation and systematisation of the social organisation. Morris's *News from Nowhere* (1890) proposes an ideal community whose inhabitants are free from the fetters of exploitation, and enjoy living their own lives by improving the quality of their goods through the skills of craftsmanship. Although these writers demonstrate different ideas about the balance between the happiness and fulfilment of the individual, and those of State, what unites their works is the belief in the whole idea of utopia itself.

The concern over the exploitive division between capital and labour (in particular, workers' submission to the mechanisation of industrialisation) is intensified by many writers in the twentieth century. The term "dystopia" is used to express fears about the ultimate outcomes of the progress in industry.[3] They embark on creating "dystopian" literature, which exhibits "an imaginary place or condition in which everything is as bad as possible", according to the definition of the *OED*. Dystopia represents the negative mirror of utopia; it prioritises fear over desire. Both feelings are basically present in utopian literature, since having a desire for a better world is produced by the sense of crisis concerning the actual world.[4] A critical analysis of the workers' submergence within the industry is conveyed through the symbolic depiction of clocks. For instance, the enormous face of the clock in the New Tower of Babel in Fritz Lang's film *Metropolis* (1929) overwhelms the audience.[5] In Yevgeny Zamyatin's *We* (1924), the clock announces the destruction of

---

[3] According to John Clute and Peter Nicholls (1993), the term "dystopia" was first used by John Stuart Mill in a parliament speech in 1868 (360). Yet writers in the nineteenth century did not yet embark on dystopian literature.

[4] Clute and Nicholls (1993) define dystopia as inferring a fear of "the oppression of the majority by a ruling elite (which varies only in the manner of its [characterisaion], not in its actions), and the regimentation of society as a whole (which varies only in its declared ends, not in its actual processes" (361).

[5] See Samuel Macey's "The Role of Clocks and Time in Dystopias" (1986).

the individual autonomy and the unchallenged dominance of a social system. Oliver Leaman in "Time, Modernity, and Destructive Habits of Thought" (1999) argues:

> Instead of threatening subjects with death for breaking the law, the state comes to seek control of the structure of life, in particular through defining acceptable roles for sexuality and the management of daily life. A system of legitimation and pedagogy results from this strategy in terms of which the state's understanding of how people ought to live becomes "natural". (135)

As such, dystopian writers consciously depict how an individual is oppressed by the totalised and inhuman social conditions. The object of dystopian novelists is to stress the anxiety that the progress of science and technology will eventually cause the loss of individuality, and of local and personal autonomy. Their target is not just limited to a conflict between labour and capital, but is also levelled at any kind of antagonism between individual members and dominant social powers in the form of social organisation and regimentation. The writers of dystopian literature challenge the economical, political and ideological systems, suggesting to their readers what society would be like if the present condition develops into an extremely negative case.

An important shift from the age of optimism to the age of scepticism is reflected in the spiritual change in the notion of human perfectibility. This spiritual transformation within the human species is embodied in the work of H.G. Wells. In the first publication of *A Short History of the World* (1922), Wells celebrates the development of science and technology through which human beings seem to have reached the best condition of life. As he puts it:

> Can we doubt that presently our race...will achieve unity and peace, that it will live, the children of our blood and lives will live, in a world made more splendid and lovely than any place or garden that we know, going on from strength to strength in an ever widening circle of adventure and achievement?

In 1946, witnessing the catastrophe of two world wars, he revised his book and added a new chapter under the title, "Mind at the End of Its Tether". The unavoidable necessity of this change and addition overtly signals Wells's fear that the progress of

technology and science cannot always lead to the well-being of humankind. On the contrary, it causes the loss of individual autonomy, of respect among workers for the sake of profits, and of numerous lives. John Passmore in *The Perfectibility of Man* (1970) describes this negative view of the utopian myth in terms of the loss of a belief in perfectible humankind. He defines this spiritual change as a transformation from "the optimistic perfectibilism of the pre-1914 world" to "the scepticism and cynicism of the post-1939 world". The writers of the former group are certainly convinced that "men not only could and should, but most certainly would, lift themselves to higher and higher stages of perfection" (414). In contrast, the writers of the post-1939 world lose their optimistic view of the inevitability and beneficial nature of progress. The negative definition of progress marks the end of a belief in human perfectibility.

Orwell's writing of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is certainly resonant with the spiritual and social concerns shared by dystopian writers: he describes man's incongruity and absurdity as seen in the wars. In the essay "The Rediscovery of Europe", he expresses his disappointment and anxiety in the following: "Progress had finally ended in the biggest massacre in history, science was something that created bombing planes and poison gas, [civilised] man, as it turned out, was ready to behave worse than any savage when the pinch came" (*CEJL* 2: 236). Also, he states:

> Up to 1914 Wells was in the main a true prophet. In physical details his vision of the new world has been fulfilled to a surprising extent. But because he belonged to the nineteenth century and to a non-military nation and class, he could not grasp the tremendous strength of the old world which was symbolised in his mind by fox-hunting Tories. He was, and still is, quite incapable of understanding that nationalism, religious bigotry and feudal loyalty are far more powerful forces than what he himself would describe as sanity. Creatures out of the Dark Ages have come marching into the present, and if they are ghosts they are at any rate ghosts which need a strong magic to lay them. (*CEJL* 2: 171-2)

It is his reflection upon the subversive events across the world that becomes the driving force behind the creation of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

As is referred to previously, Orwell intends to write a "utopia in the form of novel". Before undertaking the analysis of his text, we must take note of the author's personal viewpoints on utopia. Orwell's literary essays suggest that the author is reluctant to value utopia because of its monolithic nature. His comments on utopia are barely affirmative; he claims that utopia has always been illustrated as "favourable" in the sense that a narrative of utopia is "a description of a country so well conducted and so faultless in every way" (*CWGO* 14: 254). In his view, utopian writing in general consciously excludes and neglects some unfavourable factors in order to create the perfect social and political organisation. He refutes such a "favourable" utopia, namely the construction of a monolithic and flawless society, and concludes that utopia is "invariably unappetising, and usually lacking in vitality as well" (*CWGO* 16: 39). He claims that no reader may wish to live in a conventional utopia like "a Wellsian utopia" which stands for "a world whose keynotes are enlightened hedonism and scientific curiosity" (ibid.). His negative approach to traditional utopia as exemplified by Wells's work is related to his evaluation of Charles Dickens's novels. In his essay, "Can a Socialist be Happy?" (1943), he argues that this Victorian writer is the only one who illustrates "a convincing picture of *happiness*". Unlike the "favorable" utopian writers who depict the happiness and wellbeing of humankind by bracketing out contradictions and human complexity, Dickens is praised as the only writer who is capable of portraying the "real" picture of "happiness". Orwell's essays on traditional utopian writing and Dickens's novels seem to suggest that, for him, the meaning of happiness is arbitrary according to times and places and, therefore, the univocal depiction of a perfectly ideal society is unacceptable.

Orwell is very conscious of applying his novel to the literary genre of utopia, and this must be related to his scepticism towards perfection, totality and universality that are typical features of utopian narrative. Orwell's dystopian novel radically portrays the totalitarian society as a negative mirror of utopia. Given that utopia is rooted in the nature of man himself and offers us the "truth", namely, what "man is essentially is and what he should have as *telos* of his existence" (Tillich 296),

Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* may be interpreted as a deconstructive approach towards the affirmative and positive meaning of utopia. Ultimately, Orwell's novel is still one of the most powerful dystopian novels of the twentieth century. The force of this novel is related to the total absence of hope and belief in humanity that it expresses. This sense of loss derives from the author's insight into a totalitarian nature inherent to utopia.

DYSTOPIA AS A NEGATIVE MIRROR OF UTOPIA

The German philosopher Hannah Arendt states in her book on totalitarianism that "totalitarianism is an unprecedented phenomenon in human history, more frightening just because more *total* than any previous form of tyranny" (qtd. in Beauchamp 77). Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* echoes her idea and shows us a further condition of totalitarianism, in which the loss of individual freedom and autonomy is complete to the extent that the social organisation disallows any changes. Orwell's dystopia evokes a monolithic society including a blind worship of power, violence, mindless discipline and austerity. As O'Brien, the principle member of the Inner Party, asserts in Room 101, this nightmarish world is "the exact opposite of the stupid hedonistic Utopias that the old reformers imagined" (*1984* 279). The novel presents a conflict between the over-powerful State and the 39-year old protagonist, Winston Smith, who struggles to resist the present regime but who ultimately submits to it and is executed by the totalitarian State.

Orwell's Airstrip One, the chief city of Oceania, is a perfect bureaucratic society consisting of three classes: the Inner Party, the Outer Party, and the proles. The Inner Party is "the brains of the State", through which two percents of the population controls the whole society. Below the Inner Party, the Outer Party executes the elite's policies. Then, the group called "the proles" represents 85 percent of the total population. The proles' life is basically isolated from the Party members'. The Party slogan says, "Proles and animals are free", such that the life of these lower-class inhabitants rarely interferes with the life of Party members. The Records Department produces all cultural materials for the Party members and the proles and, to the latter group of people, it gives cheap poor-quality tabloid newspapers and pornography. This cultural practice is meant to consolidate the social structure and class hierarchy.

The totality of Oceania, and especially the life of Party members, is impeccably controlled by technology; the TV-screen is constantly switched on in order to watch the members' behaviours. Hence the Thought Police are immediately informed of and there is severe punishment for political crimes. Whereas technology and science in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) are depicted as tools to stabilise the class

hierarchy causing the loss of traditional communications, they are used, in Orwell's novel, as instruments for surveillance and torture by the despotic state. In the author's eye, the State's ideological manipulation of individuals' minds is closely related to the development of technology. For instance, in his essay "Some Thoughts on the Common Toad" (1946), Orwell expresses the fear that the world of technology may provoke the emergence of totalitarianism:

> I think that by retaining one's childhood love of such things as trees, fishes, butterflies and…toads, one makes a peaceful and decent future a little more probable, and by preaching the doctrine that nothing is to be admired except steel and concrete, one merely makes it a little surer that human beings will have no outlet for their surplus energy except in hatred and leader worship. (*CEJL* 4: 175)

The main concern underlying this statement is reflected in *Animal Farm* (1945) as well. The ignorant animals welcome the emergence of both a new despot, Napoleon, and a new technology, the windmill named "Napoleon Mill". The pigs convince the other animals that the new technology will bring them an earthly paradise. However, as the story subsequently shows, the animals' expectations are ruthlessly destroyed; what the windmill stands for is not a comfortable life with leisure and food but instead the beginning of a life of starvation and exploitation. In a similar way, Orwell shows that the Inner Party aims to construct "a world of steel and concrete of monstrous machines and terrifying weapons—a nation of warriors and fanatics, marching forward in perfect unity, all thinking the same thoughts and shouting the same slogans, perpetually working, fighting, triumphing, persecuting—three hundred million people all with the same face" (*1984* 77). The advanced technology in Oceania by no means offers a healthy life to the inhabitants. Winston is aware that most of the Party members suffer from the food shortage and live in unhealthy conditions because of the endless wars. All natural and human resources are used up in wasteful wars, though these wars are in fact contrived by the Inner Party for its ideological purposes.

The world of total integration is accomplished by paralyzing the individual's own

way of thinking. The shortages of foods and other daily products naturally prevent people from having some time to think and reflect. Moreover, freedom of speech is severely controlled and banned under the police surveillance, and the Inner Party uses any means for political ends. Their lust for complete power is theoretically and historically proved by Hannah Arendt in *The Burden of Our Time* (1951):

> With the new structures, built on the strength of supersense and driven by the motor of logicality, we are indeed at the end of the bourgeois era of profits and power, as well as at the end of imperialism and expansion. The aggressiveness of totalitarianism springs not from lust for power, and if it feverishly seeks to expand, it does so neither for expansion's sake nor for profit, but only for ideological reasons: to make the world consistent, to prove that its respective supersense has been right. (432)

The ideological purposes of the controlling State are accomplished through the manipulation of the individual's way of thinking. Indeed, Winston realises that "only the Thought Police [matters]" in Oceania (*1984* 4). *Nineteen Eighty-Four* illustrates the case of an absolute totalitarian State in which any alternative ways of thinking is disallowed. In particular, Newspeak, doublethink, and the mutability of the past are three conditions put in place in order to fight the possibility of thinking (*1984* 28), meaning that Orwell's totalitarian world is consolidated through psychological and intellectual manipulations.[1]

Newspeak is the official language of Oceania, and stands for a linguistic project

---

1 With regard to the impossibility of freedom of thought in totalitarian society, Orwell in an essay writes: "The greatest mistake is to imagine that the human being is an autonomous individual. The secret freedom which you can supposedly enjoy under a despotic government is nonsense, because your thoughts are never entirely your own. Philosophers, writers, artists, even scientists, not only need encouragement and an audience, they need constant stimulation from other people.... I believe one of the things that will surprise us will be to find how little worth-while writing of any kind—even such things as diaries, for instance—has been produced in secret under the dictators" (*CEJL* 3: 160).

of the Inner Party which is meant to prevent nuanced thoughts and multiple meanings in language. Thus, in Winston's dystopia, the old language is in the process of recreation; it is transformed to "Newspeak", which is defined as plain, practical, direct and less ambiguous. The size of vocabulary decreases, and instead the use of the affix "un—" or "plus—" is applied to express specific volition; thus the word "warm" is no longer necessary in Oceania, as it is replaced with the word "uncold". As well, the term "dark" is newly expressed as "unlight" (*1984* 315). Newspeak also contains newly created words for political purposes. They are compounded words such as "goodthink" (which means "to think in an orthodox manner") and "Miniluv" (the Ministry of Love"). The purpose of such compounded words is to exterminate all terms that are "ideologically neutral" (319). Eventually, it is supposed to be impossible to convey "unorthodox" and dissident opinions in Newspeak. Thus, Syme (who is a philologist as well as a specialist in Newspeak) tells Winston that there will be "no reason or excuse for committing thought crime" in the future (55). The scheme of Newspeak is to exterminate certain modes of thought and to render the meaning of a word completely fixed. As for 'doublethink', it means "real control" in the old language of the past. This is designed to make people accept two contradictory ideas simultaneously. Those who master doublethink attune to the official slogans of the Party as "War is Peace", "Freedom is Slavery", and "Ignorance is Strength" (*1984* 6). Newspeak and doublethink are vital tools to threaten and destroy individual freedom of thought.[2]

The mutability of the past is also crucial to consolidate the totalitarian system of Oceania. Orwell's totalitarian society can be described as "ahistorical"; this corresponds to the deliberate practice of cutting the historical flow from the past to the future in order to acquire the eternal present. The contents of historical texts are ceaselessly changed so that no authentic truth may be discovered. As O'Brien says, "We, the Party, control all records, and we control all memories"; keeping one's own memories is regarded as heresy or, at worse, impossible (*1984* 260). Likewise, cultural

---

[2] With regard to Orwell's description of language in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, see also Paul Chilton's essay, "Orwell's Conception of Language" (1984).

roots are expunged and all traditional units of measure are standardised. When Winston starts recording what happens in his life, he is totally dismayed at the loss of a sense of time, wondering if the date is truly "April 4th, 1984" (*1984* 9). In Orwell's Oceania, there are no ways of assigning dates, nor are there any assured signs of linkage between the past, present, and future. As the shrewd contrivance and fabrication of history by the Inner Party is linked to its ideological purpose, Winston's diary is certainly a political crime. As well, the complete abolition of Oldspeak leads to the extinction of the past, so that Oceania becomes an "ahistorical" place, in which people live in an eternal present.[3] As Winston fears: "History has stopped. Nothing exists except an endless present in which the Party is always right" (*1984* 162). In this social and cultural circumstance, the protagonist's act of keeping a diary must be understood as a challenge to the dominant political system. Winston also hopes that he will gain a sense of living by marking the date in his diary, whilst the Party members in Oceania are deprived of the consciousness of living in a particular moment of history. Winston struggles to keep the "truth" in a society in which citizens obliterate their memories and switch them to new ones without any doubts.

Orwell stresses timelessness of Airstrip One, in which a sense of history is totally removed. His depiction of this "ahistorical" society shows how his Oceania corresponds to a negative image of utopia, such that a perfectly ideal place is prevented from changing whatsoever. According to Peter Ruppert (1986) and Gary Samuel Morson (1981), utopia tends to be "closed" in the sense that history stops; in other words, utopia is located "outside history" (Ruppert 64). These critics describe the "ahistorical" nature of utopia which shows the tendency to seek "an escape *from* history". The timeless and static character of utopia is illustrated through the "closed" society of Oceania, in which a total abandonment of the self in favour of the collective is achieved through the loss of a sense of the past. Within this society the members are numbed and fully passive, to the same extent that the inhabitants of any utopia are satisfied with their living conditions without having any further demands and requests.

These totalitarian features in Oceania are described through the view point of

---

[3] Cf. Paul Alkon's essay, "The Utopian Calendar" (1999).

Winston Smith. The undesirability of this nightmare can be measured by the individual feelings that Winston conceals. The conflict between the individual needs of the inner being and the external laws of totalitarian society is highlighted through the author's deliberate focus upon the personal feelings of the protagonist. From the beginning of the narrative, Winston expresses his dissident stance. The readers are shown his desperate attempts to preserve his own ideas, his emotions, his wish for privacy, and his dream of finding someone with whom he can sincerely communicate. His appreciation of "useless" things marks the significant difference between him and other Party members; he describes Mr Charrington's transparent paperweight as beautiful, and such an assertion challenges this emotionless and practical society (*1984* 99). As well, he desperately tries to preserve Oldspeak, because of its "vagueness and its useless shades of meaning" and its beautiful cadences (55). Winston adheres to the language of the past, because he firmly believes that he can express various emotions, ideas, and subtle feelings through this language. The "unorthodox" behaviour and ideas of the protagonist correspond to his complaints about what is absent in Oceania; the 39-year protagonist laments the fact that "today there [are] fear, hatred and pain, but no dignity of emotion, no deep or complex sorrows" (32). He regrets also that having family, privacy, love and friendship is no longer regarded as a sound idea. Accordingly, the reader comes to understand how people's minds are manipulated in this world of order and reason.

Winston's critical awareness of his present condition evokes in us the sense of crisis, since Winston is likely the last man who can challenge this society; without him, this world seems to be a complete nightmare. In fact, during the writing of this last novel, Orwell wrote to Fredric Warburg that he was hesitating between "Nineteen Eighty-Four" and "The Last Man in Europe" for the title of the book (*CEJL* 4:507). Orwell's letter to Warburg implies that the author aims to deal with Winston's conflict with the totalitarian regime, rather than to represent the whole design of the fictive society. He shows the loss of individual autonomy in a controlled society through Winston's point of view, and Winston's final submission to Big Brother means the end of the "last man", i.e. both the end of the belief in "the spirit of Man" and the victory of

the evil.

Orwell's aim to portray "the last man" is interwoven with his awareness that his book is "a utopia in the form of novel". His text can be seen as the first step in dystopian narratives to pay particular attention to portraying human characters. In their study of utopian and dystopian literature, Reneta Galsteva and Irina Rodnyanskaya (1991) define utopia as "sociocentric" and dystopia as "personalistic". While major utopian novels are in pursuit of grand narratives which express the abstractions of philosophy, dystopian writers focus more on specific matters as a means of investing its institutionalised forms and structures of power within society. Thus Philip Thody (1996) and Irving Howe (1962) consider that a utopian fiction cannot be categorised as a "novel" because it deals with *ideas* rather than characters. Although Orwell's text pictures the State predominating over the individuals, it is centred on the protagonist, Winston Smith, and his conflict with the society. His novel demonstrates the characteristic of dystopia defined by Fredric Jameson (1994) that dystopian writers more focus on "what happens to a specific subject or character" in order to highlight the degree of unhappiness and rage on the protagonist's part (Jameson 56).

It is the transformation of "sociocentric" utopia into "personalistic" dystopia that differentiates dystopia from the "non-narrative quality" of utopia. Traditionally, utopia is described by a fictive visitor whose naïve point of view leads to compare the utopian dream with historical reality; thus, the visitor's point of view is limited to the introduction of the new society. Bertrand de Jouvenel (1965) argues that this narrative strategy in utopia is efficiently applied in order to convey the author's idea about the new social vision:

> Indeed the author has chosen this literary device because the fiction of a journey committed him to lively descriptions, and allowed him to paint pleasing pictures of daily life in utopia, whereby he prepares us to accept the institutional scheme he advocates. See how delightful a world this is, and now listen to the means whereby it is contrived! Such is the mode of persuasion characteristic of and essential to utopian writing, so much so that the designation of "Utopia" should be denied to any exposition of a "New Model" of Society which is bereft of pictures concerning daily life. (221)

The point of view of the outsider is no longer used in dystopian literature. Protagonists are no longer the visitors of unknown places. Rather, they are inhabitants of the community and their viewpoints are an anti-thesis of the dominant ideology in which they live. Orwell is one of the dystopian writers who consolidate this literary strategy. Therefore, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is the narrative about the 39-year old protagonist who criticises the apparently "ideally" totalised and unified society. The novel shows the process by which the anti-regime protagonist heads to his submission to the totalitarian regime. Through this process, his behaviour and ideas illuminate the horrors of a monolithic and totalitarian society; his anxiety, agony, and spiritual dilemma in the face of the existing society are thus underscored. If utopia extols the equality of the members of society, Orwell's dystopia questions the value or the necessity of man's conformity to social protocols, which he considers to be the surrender of individual uniqueness.

The power of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is ascribable to its creation of "Big Brother", which is the complete and unchallenged authority of totalitarianism. Yet Orwell does not only aim to sketch a life in totalitarian society. He is also aware that any forms of system, institutions, social structures, and discourses have the potential to become oppressive power. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, he shows that a despotic society may be the extreme image of fascism that actually took place in real history, but it may also be an extreme exaggeration of some democratic countries. In fact, the Soviet Union and the United States, the two countries intended to be the materialisation of utopia on earth, may show that, from this point of view, they are barely different. Max Eastman in 1922, among others, stated: "I feel sometimes as though the whole modern world of Capitalism and Communism and all were rushing toward some enormous efficient machine-made doom of the true values of life" (qtd. in Howe 13). Both the capitalist and communist States are deeply involved in the technological management of human beings. The following comment by the German philosopher Erich Fromm (1963) aptly grasps Orwell's thematic concern in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* concerning the oppression by the ruling power in all countries:

> [Doublethink] is already with us, and not merely something which will happen in the future, and in dictatorships.... Orwell quite obviously refers to the falsification of socialism by Russian communism, but it must be added that the West is also guilty of a similar falsification. (209)

In his non-published introduction to *Animal Farm*, Orwell already states how freedom of thought and free speech are threatened in the West: "The sinister fact about literary censorship in England is that it is largely voluntary. Unpopular ideas can be silenced, and inconvenient facts kept dark, without any need for any official ban" (qtd. in Chomsky 65). This never-published introduction is highly valued for its "accuracy", as referred by successive intellectuals like Noam Chomsky (1996):

> For reasons too obvious to review, the topic of Orwell's unpublished introduction is far more important for Westerners than yet another exposure of the crimes of the hated enemy in his most famous work, a few years later. And of much greater intellectual interest as well. The methods of control used in the "most despotic" governments are transparent; those of the "most free and most popular" societies are far more interesting to unravel. Had Orwell's work focused on these vastly more important and intellectually challenging issues, he would be no hero in the West. (69)

Nineteen Eighty-Four conveys Orwell's recognition that totalitarian States and 'free' societies are, in essence, hardly distinguishable, in as much as the rulers ultimately rely on the control of human thoughts and behaviour.

The practice of forging historical records and language, as depicted in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, is by no means non-fiction; it was, and still is, practised by some states in actuality. Winston's concern with time as well as history echoes Orwell's personal concerns. It was his experience during the Spanish Civil War that has inspired him to

investigate the process of producing history [4]:

> I remember saying once to Arthur Koestler, "History stopped in 1936", at which he nodded in immediate understanding. We were both thinking of totalitarianism in general, but more particularly of the Spanish Civil War. Early in life I had noticed that no event is ever correctly reported in a newspaper, but in Spain, for the first time, I saw newspaper reports which did not bear any relation to the facts, not even the relationship which is implied in an ordinary life. (*CEJL* 2: 294)

Orwell thinks of 1936 as the turning point in his conception of history. He learns the threat of a variable or mutable history from his involvement in the Spanish Civil War, in which he witnesses newspapers being re-written and manipulated by the authority. Orwell is certain that "History" has "stopped", in the sense that "official" history would never tell the "truth". After the war, he has a gnawing suspicion in regard to political systems and starts inquiring into them in terms of the producing of historical account; namely, by whom history is written, and how, and for whom history is narrated.

As is discussed earlier, Orwell's portrayal of totalitarian society in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is the antithesis of the traditional utopian vision, and his novel shows us how little difference there is between traditional utopia and the totalitarian State in terms of its monolithic, flawless nature, its preference of the State over the individual, its "ahistorical" nature, its eternal present, its absence of alternative ways of thinking, and finally, its image of a human world devoid of any change. For those who still believe in human perfectibility, Orwell's novel seems to be too depressing. In his review of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Erich Fromm (1963) expresses a confused reaction:

---

[4] The experience in Catalonia is a turning point in Orwell's life. In his essay "Why I Write" (1947), he argues how his commitment to the war has set the scene for his career as a writer: "The Spanish war and other events in 1936-7 turned the scale and thereafter I knew where I stood. Every line of serious work that I have written since 1936 has been written, directly or indirectly, *against* totalitarianism and *for* democratic socialism, as I understood it" (*Decline of the English Murder and Other Essays* 186).

"[Can] human nature be changed in such a way that man will forget his longing for freedom, for dignity, for integrity, for love—that is to say, can man forget that he is human?" (206) On reflection upon the historical events of the twentieth century, Fromm certainly understands the value of Orwell's text for the sake of its loss of humanism, "a two-thousand-year-old Western traditional hope" (205). Undoubtedly, Orwell's text is influential as it expresses anxiety and hopelessness on humankind's part after two world wars whose unbearable atrocities have been led to the extreme.

Nineteen Eighty-Four demonstrates the claim that traditional utopia's tendency to construct a perfect world may consequently produce a contrary outcome. Mark Hillegas in his *Future as Nightmare: H. G. Wells and the Anti-Utopias* (1967) analyses the literary history of utopia and dystopia and describes the nature of dystopian fiction as "a sad, last farewell to man's age-old dream of a planned, ideal, and perfected society, a dream which appeared so noble in Plato's *Republic*, More's *Utopia*, Andreae's *Christianopolis*, and Bellamy's *Looking Backward*" (3-4). In Hillegas's view, the social and political backgrounds of the twentieth century prove that utopia is embodied in "dictatorship, welfare states, planned economies and all manner of bureaucracies". Hitler's Nazi Germany and Stalin's Communist USSR demonstrate how "utopia" is finally plausible on earth, but what they also show is a negative and harmful "utopia" when the members of these societies are put into order within a rational system. As Krishan Kumar puts it, if Orwell's last novel is deemed as the "climax" of this literary genre, this is attributable to the fact that his novel is the most powerful work published *in the West* that points to the contradictions of the traditional utopias. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is the most significant work in this genre because it challenges the classical idea of utopia. Kumar (1991) states:

> The burden of the anti-utopian critique was not that utopia was impossible, the irresponsible fantasy of shallow optimists: quite the contrary. What appalled them was that the modern utopia was only too possible, that, as Mannheim and others were showing, it was indeed in the process of being [realised]. The modern utopia of science, reason and democracy was becoming the modern world. But far from liberating humanity and adding to its well-being and

> happiness, the [realisation] of utopia was bringing in a world of unprecedented servility and sterility, a world where old forms of tyranny were returning in the new guise of mass democratic politics and benevolent state planning. (*Utopianism* 93)

Such scepticism concerning the value of utopian literature is wholly developed in postmodern political and cultural debates. Yet, it is *Nineteen Eighty-Four* that paves the way for the philosophical, social and political debates, who claim that classic utopians' social visions (which are orderly, total, elite-governed and mechanical) can only be realised in the form of a totalitarian state. This postmodern view dismays those who still hold to traditional views of utopia as based on humanity, a progress towards perfection, a teleological purpose for progress, and an ontological meaning of what being human is. Orwell's text, published in the middle of the twentieth century, signals the coming age of uncertainty and ambiguity, the era of the so-called postmodern consciousness, in which theoreticians and philosophers demystify the idea of utopia constructed as a rational model for collective happiness.

THE REMAINING SENSE OF TOTALITY

From the very first sentence of the novel, Orwell skilfully creates a place which is suspended between the fictional and the real worlds. The opening sentence, "It was a bright cold day in April, and the clocks were striking thirteen" (*1984* 3), announces the fantastic nature of the story owing to the number "thirteen" on the clocks. Yet, the reader henceforth finds life in Oceania very close to the reality of post-war Britain. David Lodge in *The Art of Fiction* (1992) argues how admirably effective this opening sentence is:

> It's the anomalous word "thirteen" that tells us with wonderful economy that a very different experience is in store. Clocks, time, and the calculations that go with them, are part of the rule of reason by which we order our lives in the ordinary, familiar world. So "thirteen" is like the moment in a nightmare when something tells you you are dreaming and you wake up. But in this case the nightmare is only beginning, and the hero, at least, never wakes up—from a world in which power can decree that two and two make five. (135-6)

Orwell's writing technique in the opening scene is interpreted as "defamiliarization", one of the important literary devices in utopian and dystopian literatures. According to Darko Suvin in *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction* (1979), the psychological suspension between the fictional and naturalistic world is an essential characteristic of utopian literature and science fiction. Suvin formulates this method by referring to two critical terms which are "estrangement", as used by the Russian Formalist Viktor Shklovsky in 1917, and "alienation" that the German playwright Bertolt Brecht applied to his work during the 1930s. Suvin combines these two concepts into the single "defamiliarisation", and concludes it as a primal technique used in utopian literature. It provokes a tension and uneasiness in each reader's consciousness. Unlike myths, folktales and fantasies which imply "noncognitive estrangement", utopian and dystopian literatures show a cognitive connection to the real world through some realistic descriptions of the environment. Thus, readers are asked to compare reality with the fictional world, thereby bringing their sense of judgement into the process of

their reading and analysis of the contents of the represented world. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it is the number "thirteen" that causes a defamiliarlising effect in an apparently realistic context. Accordingly, the opening sentence guides the reader to an estranged world, provoking us to anxiety and confusion as to what belongs to reality or unreality.

According to Suvin, the effect of defamiliarisation is to construct "a heuristic model". The significance of this effect is associated with a literary strategy as defined by Terry Eagleton (1985). Eagleton argues that Brecht's epic theatre aims to be "incomplete itself, completed only in the audience's reception of it" (66). As the method calls upon the readers and the audience to compare their everyday reality and that of the fictional world, they are, in turn, inspired to discover a meaning for the text in their own ways through the particular condition of suspension. Then the "incomplete" nature of the artistic work functions serves a "heuristic" and implies an act of evaluation. Thus, the reading of a text infers an unexplored sphere in their reading of the text, which becomes the source of hope, the guide to action, which constitute the *raison d'être* of utopia.

On its publication in 1949, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was an overnight sensation. The novel's impact on the public was indeed enormous, as described in Fredric Warburg's review[1]: "This is amongst the most terrifying books I have ever read.... Orwell has no hope, or at least he allows his reader no hope, no tiny flickering candlelight of hope.... He nowhere indicates the way in which man, English man, becomes bereft of his humanity" (*CWGO* 19: 479). As the first sentence of Orwell's novel creates a place of suspension in which the reader is not certain to what extent the presented nightmare is close to reality, this sense of uncertainty causes the increased tension such as a combination of a fear and a still remaining hope. Divergent interpretations of this dystopian novel have been offered since the book's publication, including those which consider the text in terms of political ideology and those which argue that the novel aimed to be a prophecy. These various opinions prove the

---

[1] Warburg was the owner of the publishing house of Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1945) and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

complexity as well as the fecundity of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, showing the possibility for this text to be a "heuristic" model.[2]

Despite this, Orwell himself was very certain of his aim. Soon after the book was publicised, the author stated his own stance which seemed to reject any speculative interpretations:

> It has been suggested by some of the reviewers of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* that it is the author's view that this, or something like this, is what will happen inside the next forty years in the Western world. This is not correct. I think that, allowing for the book being after all a parody, something like *Nineteen Eighty-Four could* happen. This is the direction in which the world is going at the present time, and the trend lies deep in the political, social and economic foundations of the contemporary world situation.... The moral to be drawn from this dangerous nightmare situation is a simple one: *Don't let it happen. It depends on you*". (qtd. in Crick 566)

As was referred to in the previous section, the radicalised picture of a nightmarish society in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is not limited to the portrayal of the totalitarian regimes, such as Germany's fascism and Russia's communism. It is this "moral" that

---

[2] Some critics, just after the publication of this novel, review the book from the perspective of political ideology. For example, some Communists, such as Kate Carr in the *Daily Worker* and Arthus Clader-Marshall in *Reynold's News*, consider the novel to be Cold War propaganda. Clader-Marshall remarks that the purpose of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is to blame the Soviet Union, and identifies Orwell as "the lunatic fringe" of the Labour Party (4). Not only the Communists, but also the *Economist* in London and the *Wall Street Journal* in New York think that the novel is anti-Communist. Moreover, American papers, including *Time* and *Life* magazines, regard *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as containing anti-socialist polemic, pointing out that "Ingsoc" stands for the British Labour Party. Nearer 1984, the main stream of criticism seems to shift to the possibility of the novel's "prophecy". For instance, in a study of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Mathew Hodgart, 1971, holds that Orwell requires the reader to examine how far their world has headed towards the society of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. In 1974, the *Daily Telegraph Magazine* releases a special number devoted to this novel. This special issue is published for the express purpose of analysing the accuracy of the novel's prophecy. Half of the contributors argue that some elements of the novel have come true. Other scholars, by contrast, pay attention to the sources of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Some claim that many features in the novel are traceable to Orwell's own private experience, and others discuss the literary influences on this novel. See, for example, Michael Shelden in his *Orwell: The Authorised Biography* (1991), Issac Deutscher's "*1984*—The Mysticism of Cruelty" (1974), G. E. Brown in Brodie's Notes on George Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four (1990), Jonathan Rose's "The Invisible Sources of Nineteen Eighty-Four" (1992). Besides, Malcolm Pittock (1997) analyses Orwell's last novel in terms of its supernatural features.

Orwell intends to stress in his text, according to which "the stupid hedonistic Utopias that the old reformers imagined" may ultimately appear as "a world of fear and treachery and torment, a world of trampling and being trampled upon, a world which will grow not less but *more* merciless as it refines itself" (*1984* 279). In the aftermath of reading of this novel, there only remains the sheer sense of hopelessness: "no hope, no tiny flickering candlelight of hope" as Warburg writes. This implies that Orwell's strong passion and ambition to convey "the moral" overpowers the supposed function and effect of defamiliarisation. As a result, the method of defamiliarisation helps to remind readers of the author's thematic concern only, instead of giving them an unexplored space for further interpretation. The "incompleteness" inherent to the technique of defamiliarisation is, in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, paradoxically meant to achieve the "completeness" for the sake of the "moral" the author intends to convey.

The tendency to make a "complete" totality for the text is seen in Orwell's description of the characters and in his notion of language. Orwell's "moral", "*Don't let it happen; it depends on you*", is carefully interwoven into the characterisation of Winston Smith and the proles. Although Winston's anti-regime views assure the reader that he is, like the reader themselves, against such a miserable, disheartening world, his character simultaneously exaggerates the reader's anxiety and fear. For example, the protagonist has a strong devotion for his work (he engages in altering historical documents). We find him finding the greatest pleasure in this work. The sense of satisfaction and intellectual pride increases as his task becomes more complicated and challenging (46).[3] Kenneth Mathews (1991), among others, claims that Winston's attitude towards his work is an example of the protagonist's "moral vacuity" and goes on to write: "Orwell drops clues to Winston's moral bankruptcy throughout the story" (162-3). Such "moral vacuity" is also highlighted in the scene of "catechism" in which, in O'Brien's home, Winston pledges his spotless loyalty to the Brotherhood. Daphne Patai (1984) observes that "the romance between Julia and

---

[3] In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Winston thinks: "Winston's greatest pleasure in life was in his work. Most of it was a tedious routine, but included in it there were also jobs so difficult and intricate that you could lose yourself in them…delicate pieces of forgery in which you had nothing to guide you except your knowledge of the principles of Ingsoc and your estimate of what the Party wanted you to say. Winston was good at this kind of thing" (46).

Winston is far less important in the novel, and occupies less space, than the 'romance' between Winston and O'Brien" (64). Her opinion stresses the view on Winston's inhumanity. Another critic, William Steinhoff (1984), argues that "a review of O'Brien's 'catechism' throws a different light on the state of [Winston's] soul" (204); indeed, the reader is perplexed by Winston's pledge to all kinds of merciless deeds for the sake of the Brotherhood (*1984* 179-80).[4] The complexity of Winston's character is due to its duality, which leads the readers' judgement on him astray.

Winston is also ambiguous in his attitude towards the representation of the Other, namely, the proles. Winston's social and political criticism not only shows the gloomy image of Oceania, but his contempt is also turned to an ideal style of living that he finds in the life of the proles. Winston discovers the place of comfort, dignity, vitality, and fulfilment in the life of the proles. There he finds everything he is unable to gain among the Party members, in particular, a hope for the future. He says: "[If] there is hope, it lies in the proles" (*1984* 72). In opposition to the Inner Party's doctrine that the proles are as helpless as animals, Winston is convinced that the proles have the potential to overthrow the present regime when they become conscious of their inherent power (*1984* 72-3). Winston describes the heritage possessed by the proles as "the Life", whose significance is highlighted in contrast with the "dead" and emotionless life of the Party members. Whereas Party members, like Winston, are totally manipulated and subordinate to the State order, the proles enjoy their space for autonomy and individuality.[5] Enjoying their own space, spiritually and physically, the proles possess a private life, free from the State's order. Thus, what he means by "the Life" implies everything absent from the oppressed and exploited life of the Party members.

Likewise, Winston connects the active and fecund lifestyle of the proles to a sense of development. While the Party members lose their sense of history in this

---

[4] Regarding the many criticisms which denounce the ambiguous role of Winston, see James Connors's "'Do it to Julia': Thoughts on Orwell's *1984*" (1970), Patrick Reilly's "*Nineteen Eighty-Four*: The Failure of Humanism" (1982), and Malcolm Pittock's "The Hell of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*" (1997).

[5] Some critics are apt to conclude that the life of the proles serves as the reflecting mirror of the Party members. For instance, Philip Rahv in "Unfuture Utopia" (1987) argues that the life of the proles shows "an idea that appears…to run contrary to the basic tendencies of totalitarianism" (9).

timeless society, those who possess "the Life" have the potential to break through this closed world by demonstrating their powerful activity and productivity. In the scene in which Winston looks at the prole woman washing babies' diapers, he associates her "solid, contourless body" with the woman's living force to produce offspring (*1984* 228).[6] In the protagonist's eyes, this powerful woman hanging up the numerous diapers attests to the movement of life, which strengthens his belief in the "immortality" of the proles: "Sooner or later it would happen, strength would change into consciousness. The proles were immortal, you could not doubt it when you looked at that valiant figure in the yard" (*1984* 229). The proles' immortality stands for a flow of time from the present to the future, which negates the Inner Party's attempt to create an everlasting present. Likewise, the proles' "immortality" interacts with the past through their "ancestral code", which the Party members are never allowed to gain. It is assumed throughout the novel that the traditions and values of the woman washing diapers will be passed on to her numerous children and grandchildren. Old traditions and habits are valued and preserved by being passed on into the future, whereas Winston laments the fact that the Party members, including him, are never able to transmit their own ideas to their descendants, insofar as they have no parents from whom they can take over traditions and values. Nor is it likely that anything can be transmitted to children in a society in which the Party isolates and indoctrinates the children, who in an extreme situation are educated to betray their parents to the police.

The proles who represent hope as well as "the Life" are, however, nothing more than the mirror image of the "dead" life of the Party members. In other words, Orwell does not portray the proles as agents of subversion, but rather ends up by describing them living "outside—irrelevant", as O'Brien sardonically tells Winston in Room 101. Winston's final surrender to the Inner Party is associated with his conclusion that the proles are nothing more than helpless people, whose life may not affect the established social framework of Oceania. This is exemplified in the scene in which Winston

---

[6] Orwell is highly conscious of the meaning of the "proles". In an essay contributed to the *Tribune*, 17 March 1944, he writes that few Socialists know the meaning of the word "proletariat" (*CEJL* 3: 134). On the meaning of "the proles" in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Valerie Meyer explains that the term derives from "the Latin *proles* or 'offspring'", pointing out that the word "the proletariat" is originally designed to mean "the lowest, which serves the state only by breeding" (135).

comes across the two women fighting with each other for tin saucepans. In the first place the protagonist is on the edge of expectation that they will finally become conscious of their potential power to overthrow the present regime: "A riot! The proles are breaking loose at last!" (*1984* 73) However, as soon as he realises his mistake, the protagonist watches the women "disgustedly" (73). Winston witnesses the women's hand-to-hand fighting with contempt, having mixed feelings of rage and disappointment.[7] The proles, the only human group who can fight against the rationality and reason of the Inner Party, is ultimately regarded as hopeless and useless.

In a similar way, Winston's indifference to the proles' worldly desires makes him unable to appreciate their history. This is highlighted in the scene in which Winston tries to communicate with an old prole drinking in a pub. At first he believes that "if there [is] anyone still alive who [can] give you a truthful account of conditions in the early part of the century, it [can] only be a prole" (*1984* 90). The protagonist heads for the proles' quarters and tries to draw "significant" memories from the old man who still utters some extinct phrases like a "pint of wallop" (91). Yet, his attempt ends in vain: he is not able to gain any "satisfactory" memories, and this sense of helplessness leads him to a disheartening conclusion: "The old man's memory was nothing but a rubbish-heap of details.... The Party histories might still be true, after a fashion: they might be completely true" (95). Then Winston's attempt to destabilise this "ahistorical" world paradoxically leads him to believe that the Party's 'history' constitutes the most reliable and valid account.

The lack of communication between Winston and the proles can be seen as the novel's distinction which differs from other dystopian novels. For instance, Kuno in E. M. Forster's short dystopian story, and the Savage and Marx in Huxley's *Brave New World*, demonstrate some mutual understanding with those who represent the existence of the Other. In contrast, Winston never succeeds in communicating with the proles. The little "voices" of the proles barely affect his way of thinking. Undoubtedly,

---

[7] Howard Fink (1987) observes that Winston's attitude towards the proles in this scene is proof of "the most bitterly ironic attack on Winston's lack of faith in the Proles" (106).

the old prole's personal and fragmentary recollections should be appreciated as a part of the valuable memory of those who have been neglected in the process of the mainstream history of State. Yet Orwell's protagonist is unable to listen to these ignored voices and rather complies with the historical legitimacy structured by the Inner Party by thinking that their history is "true", "completely true" (*1984* 95). This loss of communication between Winston and the proles prevents speculation about any alternative societies or ideas, and helps to consolidate the completeness of the nightmarish world. Frank Winter (1984) states: "[The Proles] are, in short, everything that the Party is not. And this fact is reiterated and expanded throughout the book. It is not, however, resolved" (82). As the novel tells, the proles continue fighting for their everyday life, but their struggle for existence may never occur in the name of political reasons. The proles can be a promising subversive power, yet this hope is illusory since the proles are unable to destabilise the unity of the dystopian world. Thus, the incomplete description of the proles (through their lack of political will) is designed to prove the totality and completeness of Orwell's totalitarian regime. Accordingly, it is implied through the novel that their life is, after all, integrated into the whole social system and they present no threat at all. They are allowed to get on with their lowly lives, possessing their own culture and language, yet "there is absolutely no sign of political consciousness" among the proles (Kerr 72). Thus, the absence of a threat towards the totalitarian regime attests to the end of the hope possessed by "the last man" and consequently provides the reader with little hope for a better society. In the end, Winston's final and fatal submission to Big Brother shatters any possible hope.

Here we may remind ourselves of Orwell's aim which is to create "a utopia in the form of novel". The implication of this statement is to depart from classic utopia through the particular attention to individual characters. In doing so, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is centred on the various feelings of Winston, rather than on abstract ideas about the centralised system itself. Certainly, this literary form is the central innovation of this novel and constitutes a radically new approach with respect to traditional utopian literature. Nevertheless, it might be assumed that Orwell's novel does not break through the problem presented by Irving Howe (1962):

By its very nature the anti-utopian novel cannot satisfy the expectations we hold, often unreflectively, about the ordinary novel: expectations that are the heritage of 19th Century romanticism with its stress upon individual consciousness, psychological analysis and the scrutiny of intimate relations. When the English critic Raymond Williams complains that the anti-utopian novel lacks "a substantial society and correspondingly substantial persons", he is offering a description, quite as would a critic complaining that a sonnet lacks a complex dramatic plot. For the very premise of anti-utopian fiction is that it projects a world in which such elements—"substantial society…substantial persons"—have largely been suppressed and must now be painfully recovered, if recovered at all. (16)

For all his interest in the making of the protagonist, Orwell's description of the protagonist and the proles may not refute Howe's and Williams's fear that anti-utopian *fiction*, like utopian fiction, barely portrays a "substantial" character. Orwell's treatment of his characters attests to the vulnerability of dystopian literature as argued by the critics. Winston is interpreted as a more vehicle than a "substantial" character; it serves to show the loss of individual autonomy in the totalitarian society. Winston's final submission to Big Brother is, from this point of view, a logical result which conveys the "moral" of the novel, as defined by Orwell.

The novel's structure which is built upon totality is also reflected in the author's concept of language.[8] Orwell's idea about language is famously expressed in his "Why I Write" (1946), in which he states that "good prose is like a window pane" (*CEJL* 1:30). To him, language should function as a transparent medium through which the truth is represented. Thus, Orwell has the conviction that we can grasp *reality* through language and it is our responsibility to maintain language as transparent as possible. Roy Harris (1987) raises two main issues characterising Orwell's concern over language:

Orwellian logophobia is based on two interconnected doubts about the

---

8 Cf. Georg Lukács's *The Theory of the Novel* (1916).

> trustworthiness of the connection between words and meaning. One is that instead of revealing what is meant, words may be used to obscure or conceal it. The other is that instead of revealing what is meant, words may be used to misrepresent it. (89)

As was mentioned in the previous section of this chapter, such "Orwellian logophobia" (a fear of misused language) derives from his direct experience during the Spanish Civil War. Since then, Orwell has attacked any forces which might distort truth through the manipulation of language. "Many critics besides Orwell are fighting for the purity of prose and deriding officialese", E. M. Forster (1951) writes, "but they usually do so in a joking offhand way, and from the aesthetic standpoint. [Orwell] is unique in being immensely serious, and in connecting good prose with liberty" (61). For Orwell, to acquire and use a translucent language is to gain individual autonomy and intellectual, spiritual, and political liberty. Any forms of discourse become his targets: political discourses, capitalist advertisements, religious sermons, and principles of education.[9] He aims to investigate the process by which words are manipulated for ideological purposes. There should be no uncertainty between a word and meaning, Orwell frequently argues, and distorted truth can be prevented if "one is willing to take the necessary trouble" (*CEJL* 4:157). The inexorable society, as depicted in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, is the most extreme, radicalised illustration of a contemporary world in which language is manipulated in order to reinforce the ideologies of those who possess power. In the author's view, the emergence of the totalitarian state marks nothing less than the decline of western civilisation, which Orwell associates with the collapse of "intellectual liberty", namely, the end of a world in which "everyone shall have the right to say and to print what he believes to be right" ("Freedom of the Press" 104). He is anxious about a world in which the inhabitants would destroy their intellectual liberty. To make them aware of this, Orwell warns:

---

[9] For instance, in "Propaganda and Demonic Speech" (1944), Orwell writes: "When you examine Government leaflets and White Papers, or leading articles in the newspapers, or the speeches and broadcasts of politicians, or the pamphlets and manifestos of any political party whatever, the thing that nearly always strikes you is their remoteness from the average man. It is not merely that they assume non-existent knowledge: often it is right and necessary to do that. It is also that clear, popular, everyday language seems to be instinctively avoided" (*CEJL* 3:161-2).

"And above all, it is *your* [civilisation], it is *you*" (*CEJL* 2:276). His dystopian novel shows how the apparent progress of humankind leads not to an ideal society but to a nightmare, and the author implies that undesirable conditions can be preventable by always being vigilant about the transparent words for communication.

In light of his personal experience of the political chaos of the twentieth century, Orwell's strenuous concern with "transparent" language can be deemed as a logical conclusion. However, his passion for seeking truth through "transparent" language is, from the viewpoint of the cultural and social theories of postmodernism, required of a careful consideration. The problem lies in the Appendix of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. This sub-text was intentionally attached by the author in order to explain the language scheme of his totalitarianism.[10] "The really frightening thing about totalitarianism", says Orwell, "is not that it commits 'atrocities' but that it attacks the concept of objective truth" (*CEJL* 3:110). The Appendix illustrates this fear, as we are told that "[objective truth] could not be used in its old sense of 'politically free' or 'intellectually free'" in the time of Winston's Oceania (*1984* 313). The point we have to note is that the argument here is based on the presupposition that the meaning of "free" is shared by all readers. In other words, the Appendix implies the author's belief that a concept is firmly tied to a particular signifier, such that his own text can reach a tacit consensus among all readers from all over the world. However, the existence of such an "objective truth", of which the author is convinced, should no longer be something universally and transcendentally shared by everybody.[11] In this respect, Orwell's Appendix paradoxically reveals the author's unchallenged belief in universal knowledge and transcendental meaning in language. The Appendix discloses how the

---

10 Before the publication of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, an American publisher made it a condition of acceptance that Orwell omit the Appendix; however, the author did not accept this offer. He expressed the reason in a letter to Leonard Moore: "I can't possibly agree to the kind of alteration and abbreviation suggested. It would alter the whole colour of the book and leave out a good deal that is essential. I think it would also—though the judges, having read the parts that it is proposed to cut out, may not appreciate this—make the story unintelligible" (*CEJL* 4:544). Despite this, the necessity of keeping the Appendix has been also the object of controversies among critics. Keith Alldritt (1969) insists that the book leaves a "bitter disgust" to the readers because of this supplementary part (155). Richard Sanderson (1988) argues about many ambiguities in the Appendix and considers them as "Orwell's imperfect solutions" (593). Sanderson's opinion is supported by Roy Harris (1984).

11 Cf. Richard Rorty's "The Contingency of Language" (1986).

author uses totalising and homogeneous arguments which implicitly deny any consistency to the specificity of the local. In this respect, Orwell deals with big concepts such as democracy, freedom, liberty and human right. The effect of his novel is to *revive* and intensify these "fundamental" concepts and the description of the end of "the last Man" illustrates the loss of these concepts. As such, living in the former part of the twentieth century, Orwell does not foresee another postmodern idea that such established philosophical concepts can be *deconstructed*. The argument in Orwell's Appendix needs to be compared with Arjun Appadurai's following statement (1996): "The central feature of global culture today is the politics of the mutual effort of sameness and difference to [cannibalise] one another and thereby proclaim their successful hijacking of the twin Enlightenment ideas of the triumphantly universal and the resiliently particular" (43). Thus, the polarity between sameness and difference is challenged by today's world and needs to be considered in terms of what Appadurai terms the "fundamental disjunctures" which reject a simple world vision, let alone a centre-periphery model as depicted in Orwell's novel. Accordingly, defining terms such as "democracy" becomes all the more difficult, and we may have to take into account the complexity and indeterminacy in the meanings of big concepts such as "freedom", "truth", and "liberty".[12]

In contrast, Orwell's text shows his reliance on universal definitions of "freedom" and "liberty". His belief in "transparent" language corresponds to a belief in universal knowledge; that is, a meaning is immutable such that essence, truth and reality are the foundations of all thought, language, and experience. Here we see a similarity between Orwell and the Inner Party in terms of their reliance on a sense of totality. John Passmore (1970) states:

> One of the leading presumptions of the Enlighteners was that if once man could discover a perfect language his troubles would largely be over.... The rulers in Orwell's dystopia are in the process of constructing such a language, a language without ambiguity, which it is impossible to misunderstand, since "every concept that can ever be needed, will be expressed by exactly one word". (431)

---

[12] Cf. Terry Eagleton's *Literary Theory* (1983: 127).

Orwell's text, based on a "transparent" language, might seek to exclude any ambiguity and uncertainty in the reading of the text. When Laurence Davies (1999) probes "a hermeneutics of possibility" in major dystopian novels, he implies a similarity between Orwell's novel and traditional utopias which all apply "plain, transparent words" (Davies 212). *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is intentionally excluded from Davies's study, because the critic is aware that "the real horror of Room 101 would be *emptiness*" (210 emphasis added). This implies a total absence of ambiguity and uncertainty throughout the novel, which ultimately prevents the text from being open.[13] Consequently, the language of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* reveals how Orwell, although very critical of traditional utopian novelists because of their monolithic, total forms, ends up by failing to break through the conventional form of utopian narrative.

Orwell's beliefs in universal knowledge and objective truth are echoed in the unresolved question which Winston often faces in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: "I understand HOW: I do not understand WHY" (*1984* 83). The question is repeatedly written in Winston's diary and is eventually left unsolved. The protagonist's inability to find the answer is overlapped by the author's dilemma concerning human nature, in particular about man's desire for power in profound ways. The question Winston presents suggests that the author believes that there is a transcendental reason. By contrast, seeking some truth to such a question is inapplicable to the postmodern consciousness, which claims that it is no longer possible to find ontological certainty and thus focuses on the *process* of examination at the expense of true answers. Thus, postmodern concern is not "WHY" but "HOW". Orwell's novel, on the contrary, tries to understand "WHY" humans always seek for more power; it implies the hidden hope for a universal, true solution.

The literary critic Irving Howe writes that "Orwell's book is impressive for its motivating passion" (16). Certainly, it is the author's passion that becomes the driving force to create such a powerful novel. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is innovative in its

---

[13] In addition, Davies argues that Orwell's novel lacks the sense of laughter, which he defines as an important factor of dystopian novels.

anticipation of the theoretical debate over the negation of utopia based on a complete ideal which leads to a potentially totalitarian system. At the same time, Orwell's novel is itself victim of the totalised structure of a utopian narrative. His text embodies the author's belief that his novel stands for "significant narrative, narrative in which events have a deep, symbolic significance for the whole world, narrative in which the local and the universal are united" (Craig 1996: 155). The "significant narrative" that the author aims to demonstrate evolves around the "moral", "*Don't let it happen; it depends on you*". The moral strengthens the didactic nature of his text and this didactic purpose is interwoven with the writing of the novel as a warning; as Orwell himself claims soon after the publication of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, his book is a *warning* rather than a forecast. The literary critic and Orwell's best friend, George Woodcock (1966) writes in his autobiographical and critical study of Orwell's writing that he is "the last of a nineteenth-century tradition of individualist radicals which bred such men as Hazlitt, Cobbett and Dickens" (50-1). Orwell has a strong nostalgia for the nineteenth century, in the sense that it is "a world where absolute concepts of good and evil still had meaning, where right and wrong were distinct and sharply defined" (Craig 189-90). The nineteenth-century ideas are linked to the idea of defining the novel as a didactic warning that the unwanted outcome of the future is immanent to the present, therefore, it is up to *us*. This sense of warning evident in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* presupposes the idea that history is the linear movement from past to future.[14] As well, the belief that the future (i.e. the effect) can be changed by the present (i.e. the cause) suggests a similarity with traditional utopia based on the teleological idea that the end (ideal system) justifies the means (construction of a rational system).

Although Paul Alkon (1999) writes that "Orwell brilliantly detached a year from the calendar of real time to serve forever as the most important marker on the dystopian calendar of political regress" (183), we may now claim that Orwell's dystopia is similar to traditional utopia in the sense that both include "ahistorical"

---

[14] Such fear, as expressed by Orwell, is tightly connected to the nineteenth-century desire to found "a synoptic and universal history" (Docherty 2). In other words, Orwell does not abandon this desire when other writers start to be uncertain of the relevance of such established historical concept.

places in which the security of the State is prioritised above the happiness of its members. Thus, Bernard Bergonzi (1985) aptly states: "The central paradox of Orwell's literary personality arises from the tension between his backward-looking, conservative imagination and his radical political convictions" (221). Moreover, the novel's main theme of the loss of individual freedom under the State's oppression appears to be "optimistic" from today's literary and cultural perspective. Alkon writes:

> Orwell's book at least leaves us with the portrait of a struggle presented as a utopian ideal within the dystopian situation. If the outcome is tragic the message is clear: resist. …Orwell gives us the comfort of knowing what ought to be done and the hope that outside his fiction it might succeed and would in any case be an admirable attempt just as it is within the fiction. (192)

This argument about the "optimistic" characteristic of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is related to the remaining sense of totality, a linear history, and a didactic sense on which the text is based.

As the climax of dystopian literature, Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* has become the reference for the writers of subsequent generations. According to John Clute and Peter Nicholls (1993), "dystopian images are almost invariably images of future society, pointing fearfully at the way the world is supposedly going in order to provide urgent propaganda for a change in direction" (360). Chad Wish (1962) considers that dystopian novels are "useful warnings that would lead not to a conservative anti-utopian position but rather to a Utopian response to existing social conditions that would prevent them from reaching the outcomes portrayed" (qtd. in Moylan 126). Thus, such inventive narratives involve speculation over the future of humankind, whereby the reader is required to have a more cautious approach to their existing social conditions. Referring to this tendency in dystopian fiction, Lyman T. Sargent (1993) argues that a warning presented by a dystopian novel implies that "choice, and therefore hope, are still possible" (26). Understood in this way, the disheartening political system, depicted in dystopian novels, are designed to offer a warning to the reader, so that they still have the possibility of avoiding the daunting outcome

presented to them.

Such definitions of dystopian literature are certainly formulated in relation to a reading of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. By evoking the moral, "*Don't let it happen*", the text serves as a warning to the reader. However, the paradoxical nature of this novel demonstrates some weaknesses in "dystopia". That is to say, dystopia does not completely depart from the conventions of utopian literature in terms of totality, universal morality, ontological truth and the transcendental meaning. Thus, John Huntington in his "Utopian and Anti-Utopian Logic: H. G Wells and His Successors" (1982) argues that both utopian and dystopian writers embrace "the imaginative attempt to put together, to compose and endorse a world" (123). The utopian text is, according to Huntington's argument, "an exercise in thinking through a way things might fit together, might work; it strives for consistency and reconciles conflict" (123). Despite its function as a negative mirror, dystopian writing is similar to utopian literature insofar as both imagines "a coherent whole, just one that is worse than the given society" (Huntington 124). Huntington concludes that utopian and dystopian texts are designed as thought experiments that "lure the reader towards an ideal or…drive the reader back from a nightmare" (124). The difference between utopia and dystopian literature, based on their treatment of good and bad principles, have many features in common. Also, John Passmore (1970) points to an affinity between utopia and dystopia:

> The classical Utopians exhort men: "This is what you ought to try to bring about!"; the modern dystopians exhort men: "This is what you ought to stop!" Yet the fact remains that in content many of the modern dystopias are not so very different from the classical utopias: in essence, they are Plato's Republic transformed by modern technology. It is a tribute to the quality of Plato's imagination that his ideal society still so influences men's minds, whether they contemplate it with delight or recoil from it with horror. (422-3)

The importance of Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* must be analysed in light of these critical views. Or these critical reviews may be traceable to Orwell's text. The novel

has had an immense influence on subsequent utopian writers, for whom the presence of this novel is inescapable, providing them with some crucial issues which they have engaged with. It urges them to consider how to step beyond this powerful text, questioning them how they might address and resolve the issues that Orwell's novel leaves behind.

Although E. M. Forster (1951) describes Orwell as one of the few novelists of the twentieth century who made a great effort to "see what he can of this contradictory and disquieting world and to follow its implications into the unseen", Orwell in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* does not seem to offer a place for "the unseen" due to the nature of the complete nightmare that the novel portrays. Instead, the final episode in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* proves the "emptiness" of this novel. Just before the moment of his "evaporation", Winston is totally "cured" to the extent that he loves Big Brother. We find him being *annoyed* by "a memory floated in his mind" in the last scene. The memory is about his mother, which gives him "a moment of reconciliation" and his "earlier affection for her [has] temporarily revived" (*1984* 309). A fragment of his memories about his mother inculcates the meaning of love to him: "If you loved someone, you loved him, and when you had nothing else to give, you still gave him love" (171). After all, Winston negates this memory involving happiness and generosity, and concludes that what comes up in his mind must be "a false memory" (309). Thus, the remaining concept of humanity is ruthlessly destroyed, and only human frailty is acknowledged. The end of "the last man" symbolically means the end of "the spirit of Man", which means the victory of the despot. O'Brien in Room 101 tells Winston, "The command of the old despotism was 'Thou shalt not". The command of the totalitarians was 'Thou shalt'. Our command is 'Thou art'" (267). He goes on to say: "Progress in our world will be progress towards more pain. The old [civilisations] claimed that they were founded on love or justice. Our is founded upon hatred. There will be no loyalty, except loyalty towards the Party. There will be no love, except the love of Big Brother" (279). In the despotic society in Oceania, love means betrayal of other individuals for the sake of the collective system. Its totalitarianism constitutes the final condition of humankind, the flawless world of totality, and the

result of progress and dreams as envisaged by the old utopians. Thus, the reading of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* forbids hope. In other words, the author's passion produces an influential text, which does play the role of "heuristic" text. As the following chapters of the thesis demonstrate, successive writers in utopian and dystopian literatures need to embark on their own creations by referring to both the strength and the weakness of Orwell's powerful novel.

Chapter II
Anthony Burgess's A Clockwork Orange
Dystopias of Uncertainty

Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* (1962) has a powerful effect on readers owing to its depiction of violence. Assisted by the visual images of Stanley Kubrick's film (1972), the novel highlights a kind of violence distinct from the one in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. While Orwell presents violence in order to show the complete and perfect power of a dictatorial State, violence in Burgess's novel is rather represented as purely gratuitous emerging from individuals in any part of society.

The novel starts with a world controlled by young gangs who inflict social violence through numerous crimes and delinquency. Then, in the face of such a social disorder, the government's aim is to construct a more peaceful and stable society by rehabilitating these young criminals. Yet, the reader realises that the government's policy turns out to have a "violent" nature which violates human rights. The conspiracy of the government with scientists marks the emergence of another style of dystopia in which the individuals are scientifically conditioned and deprived of free will. The opposing figures of violence, which the delinquent Alex and the government represent respectively, open a debate on ethical principles.

This chapter consists of three sections. The first section will deal with Burgess's own conceptions of canonical utopian and dystopian novels. It is particularly noteworthy that he considers that Orwell's dystopia does not break the conventional structure of utopia. The second section of this chapter will focus on the structure of *A Clockwork Orange*, in which two opposing forms of dystopia are respectively represented by the young gang and the State. Unlike other dystopian protagonists, Alex is as powerful as the State's authority, which implies the absence of a Big Brother figure. Moreover, the reader is unable to choose the good side as opposed to the bad one; Alex's actions are as despicable as the State's. Therefore, Burgess's dystopia expresses a sense of uncertainty; and the third section of this chapter will show that Stanley Kubrick's film version of the book reinforces this feeling.

TOWARDS A NEW DYSTOPIA

The originality and place of *A Clockwork Orange* rests on Burgess's critical reviews of canonical utopian and dystopian works. He starts his critical approach to utopian literature with a reflection upon H. G Wells's works, and he describes this author as "the only progressive writer of the early modern age to have been absorbed and reacted against" ("Utopias and Dystopias" 38). Nowadays, Wells is regarded as an icon of the idea that rationalism and science are paths for the ideal world. Wells's earlier novels demonstrate that humankind can progress through science and up to a point of general Enlightenment. However, because of wars and other human follies, the novelist has eventually to reverse his optimistic view and rejects the concept of human perfectibility. By the same token, the political chaos of the twentieth century contradicts the optimistic futurist images as presented in utopian writings; thus, the social vision described by "scientific liberals" turns out to be no longer appealing. Wells, the master of such utopian literature, has to add a new chapter in the re-publication of *A Short History of the World*; and the pessimistic mood in this added chapter shows that he "lived to see the break-up of his own rational dream and believed that homo sapiens had come to the end of his tether" (Burgess "Utopias and Dystopias" 39).

A new style of utopian fiction is progressed in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932). Starting with a very Wellsian proposition, Huxley demonstrates how science and technology make it possible to materialise a kind of utopia on earth. His novel suggests that Ford's introduction of mass production techniques into the manufacture of cars is the cause of a crucial change in human history. In Huxley's fictional world, Ford's mass production triggers a rapid creation of wealth but, at the same time, leads to greater uniformity among human beings. Likewise, biological and behavioural sciences are developed in this "brave world", such that man's natural impulse is scientifically controlled so that nobody can commit a crime anymore. Then, in this perfect society, immortality becomes possible and everybody enjoys happiness.

Nevertheless, this "blameless" society is suddenly faced with the interference of an outsider from a wild, primitive region. This perfect utopian society is then turned

upside down by the outsider John, who has a different view on life. John, "the Savage", laments that family has disappeared and questions where he can find the concept of romantic love. He is terrified by the fact that workers are no longer valued as individuals. John despairs of the world in which no one is uniquely valuable in the eyes of others. In opposition to the Controller of this society, the Savage implores: "I don't want comfort, I want God, I want poetry, I want real danger, I want freedom, I want goodness. I want sin" (*Brave New World* 219). Yet his desperate wish is derisively ignored. Disheartened by the fact that he will be never able to change the consciousness of the members of his society, the Savage in the end can find no way-out except by crucifying himself for this "sinless", perfect world.

Brave New World expresses the dilemma and irony in the process of achieving utopia on earth.[1] The price of this paradise is the deprivation and loss of humanity. In this respect, Huxley embarks on the making of dystopian fiction as the negative mirror of utopia as the earthly paradise. As was discussed in Chapter I, from the end of the nineteenth century, novelists of this literary genre show their scepticism towards the outcome of the progress of science and technology. In Huxley's novel, the Savage's craving for a sense of beauty, melancholy, anger and love tells us that utopia, whose *raison d'être* is basically rooted in the nature of human kind itself, leaves behind something what makes us human. This contradiction reflects the author's fear about the unwanted outcomes of utopia.

Despite the general view that Huxley's *Brave New World* is one of the most important forerunners of the dystopian novels, Burgess questions it for the reason that there still remains "a place for optimism" in his work (1987: 42). A place for optimism

---

[1] Huxley deliberately quotes Nicolas Berdyaev's words in French as an epigraph to *Brave New World*. They articulate the author's principal concern: "Les utopies apparaissent comme bien plus réalisables qu'on ne le croyait autrefois. Et nous nous trouvons actuellement devant une question bien autrement angoissante: Comment éviter leur réalisation définitive?... Les utopies sont réalisables. La vie marche vers les utopies. Et peut-être un siècle nouveau commence-t-il, un siècle où les intellectuels et la classe cultivée rêveront aux moyens d'éviter les utopies et de retourner à une société non utopique, moins 'parfaite' et plus libre". For the translation of this epigraph, see John Passmore (422).

corresponds to "the fact of enlightenment" seen in his text. According to Burgess, Huxley is "always enough of a realist to know that there is a place for optimism" (1987: 42). Although Burgess does not present a complete assessment of Enlightenment in Huxley's dystopia, it is certain that his dystopian narrative still maintains "a place for optimism" for the value of utopia.[2] The authoritarian figure in *Brave New World* proves this, since the Controller's ultimate purpose is his people's happiness and well-being. In this respect, Huxley's Controller reckons with the fundamental craving for utopia, the dream of "what man is essentially and what he should have as *telos* of his existence" (Tillich 1965: 296). Huxley's ruler aims to construct and achieve a perfect world of happiness and satisfaction. Like the classic utopians, the Controller aims to establish the happiest basis for a civilised community, representing an optimistic belief, the positive expectation of what society would be like if some deficient elements were fully developed.

Such a "place for optimism" is completely absent from Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Orwell's ruler is eager to create a world of total nightmare. Burgess evaluates the impact of this novel, noting that it offers "one of the few dystopian visions to have changed men's habits of thought" ("Utopias and Dystopias" 43).[3] Orwell is one of the typical models of twentieth-century writers who, more than at any other times, "have tried to find an answer to the question of right and wrong by involving themselves in politics" (Thody 160). His political and moral principles include his dilemma over class consciousness and his commitment to the life of the poor in Northern England. His last novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, reflects the position that the author had reached, showing "the sickness of [a] disillusioned liberal" (Stinson 47). From this perspective, Orwell's main concern is with moral issues rather than the consequences of the development of science and technology, as seen in Huxley's text. Orwell's rigorous investigation pertains to the similarity between classic utopias and totalitarian regimes and shows how the process towards dystopia is present in any

---

[2] As some critics point out, dystopian novels show the value of utopia through an image of violation. In regard to this critical view of dystopia, see Chapter I.

[3] Cf. Rupport's study of utopian literature (1986).

kinds of society. On this point, Burgess highly praises his achievement: "[The] argument against oligarchical collectivism is perhaps not one based on a vague tradition of 'liberty' but one derived from awareness of contradictions in the system itself" (1987: 48). Living through the end of the Second World War and the beginning of the Cold War, Burgess realises that the key phrase "War is Peace" in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* becomes real when nuclear weapons are used as deterrents. Burgess's opinion of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* comes from its insight into such contradictions and incongruities of modern politics. The vindication of Orwell's warning places the novel itself as the climax of this literary genre and the rise of dystopian literature challenges the meaning of constructing utopia.

However, Orwell is not immune from Burgess's criticism. In the first part of his novel, *1985* (1978), Burgess objects to *Nineteen Eighty-Four* that Orwell "gave us nothing new" and was "only telling us what Milton told Cromwell's England" (39). Burgess's analysis of Orwell's last novel provides us with an important consideration of this masterpiece of dystopian literature, which few critics have ever grappled with. Burgess's review is particularly significant because of its consideration on the "Ingsoc Metaphysic". He connects it to Orwell's metaphysical approach to society and life with a dependence on the concepts of continuity, transcendental idea, and totality. Burgess argues that Orwell fails to break through "the intellectual game of constructing a working model of utopia, or cacotopia" (*1985* 39).[4] As a result of the writer's dependence upon Western metaphysics, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* ends up by illustrating "the total and absolute, planned, philosophically consistent subordination of the individual to the collective that Orwell is projecting into a future" (*1985* 19). And this explains, as we saw in the previous chapter, the affinity of Orwell's novel with classic utopian narrative.

Burgess also considers the necessity to break through the dual structure typical of utopian and dystopian novels. For instance, in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the past is idealised with a great nostalgia as "a real world of solid objects" (Burgess 1978: 33). The proles, who may remind us of the image of primitive barbarians described by

---

[4] The term "cacotopia" is a synonym for "dystopia". Cf. Nicolls (1993: 360).

Rousseau, are depicted as the only people who possess the capability to subvert the present regime. Their value is harnessed with the past and tradition, when people could have a decent life. Yet, such ideals belonging to the proles can be significant only if they are contrasted with the Other, namely, the Inner Party. This binary structure is also applied to Orwell's portrayal of the city as the representation of the present as opposed to the countryside identified with the past. In this, Orwell follows the characteristic structure of utopian narrative, in which the contrast between the city and countryside is a well-known theme, as in Thomas More's *Utopia* or William Morris's *News from Nowhere*. Orwell's references to the past and to the proles show his conservatism. Dick Hebdige (1988) argues that Orwell is interested in "preserving the 'texture' of working-class life against the bland allure of post-War affluence" (51). Hebdige's criticism implies the limited function of the proles; their lack of political concern and indifference shows how *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is still subordinated to the static structure of utopian narrative, in which no characters act as agents to destabilise the existing society.

Burgess's critical reviews of major dystopian works constitute important sources for Burgess's creation of his own dystopian novel. Thus, he refuses the conventional way of illustrating human figures in dystopian novels. We saw that the main character in dystopia is no longer a visitor but an inhabitant, which implies a shift from the "sociocentric" to the "personalistic" emphasis on the author's part.[5] The "personalistic" dystopia stresses the place of the individual within a society, along with her feelings. Readers are then required to judge the fictional society through the standards of their own life, and "these criteria are often reinforced by the similar judgements of characters who rebel against the similar society in which they are caught" (Irvin 111). The Savage's desperate claim to "the right to be unhappy" and Winston's firm belief in "the spirit of Man" function to assure the reader's belief in the possibility of a decent world. Burgess, in contrast, considers that such dystopias lack complexity in their portrayal of human beings; they do not illustrate individual figures with any depth. He then attempts to describe more subtle characters, moving away

---

[5] Cf. The first section of Chapter I.

from conventional dystopian novels which evolve around the one-dimensional, less developed protagonist:

> Accept that man is imperfect, that good and evil exist and you will not, like Wells, expect too much from him. One characteristic of the contemporary novel is this acceptance of imperfect man, though not necessarily in a shoulder-shrugging what-can-we-do-about-it way. (1987: 39)

Creating an "imperfect" character is an attempt to overcome the dystopias which are centred on intellectual "hypothesis". Philip Thoddy (1996) argues that "[Both] Orwell and Huxley deal with ideas rather than with people. Neither is particularly interested in human relationships, and both tend to simplify issues to make them more immediately accessible to the reader" (177). The portrayal of characters in former dystopias is, such as Orwell's and Huxley's, restricted by ideological references that the novel tends to convey. By contrast, Burgess aims to develop the "personalistic" nature of dystopia which focuses on "what happens to a specific subject or character" (Jameson 1994). As a result, he presents the turbulent protagonist, Alex, whose noxious behaviour is morally unacceptable. The gap between the readers' and the protagonist's value judgment prevents us from expecting an ethical and moral foundation. Alex is the true rebel, who tries to destabilise the society and its central authority.

Burgess's choice of a youth as the protagonist for his novel needs to be construed in terms of the social and cultural contexts of the 1960s and 70s. *A Clockwork Orange* foreshadows the rise of a new literary style that Tom Moylan calls "critical utopia". The atmosphere of politics and culture around this time leads to the creation of new utopian novels, which particularly express "a rejection of hierarchy and domination and the celebration of emancipatory ways of being as well as the very possibility of utopian longing itself" (Moylan 1986: 13). These texts convey some marginalised "voices" of society with their specific criticisms against the dominant social institutions. The subject pertains to women, the young, the ethnic minorities and anyone who advocates an impending ecological crisis. The main characters of "critical utopia" are no longer admirers of a perfect social order; rather, they look at the new

society with a critical distance and act as the agent deconstructing the existing world of totality. The French philosopher Gilles Deleuze claims that the particular mood in society in the 1960s and 70s has a powerful effect on the intellectuals insofar as they deal with topics which stop "being universal and become specific" (*Negotiations* 87-8). Thus, people become conscious that their own individuality, i.e. their proper being, is source of political action (Deleuze 88). Certainly, the formation of such "critical utopia" is a natural response to the social and cultural background of the 1960s and 70s.[6]

Burgess shares the concerns of "critical utopia". The main characters in the "critical utopia" act as the agents of transformation, although "the heroes of social transformation are presented off-centre and usually as characters who are not dominant white, heterosexual, chauvinist, males but female, gay, non-white, and generally operating collectively" (Moylan 1986: 45). These active heroes of "critical utopia" are different from the conventional dystopian heroes, since dystopian protagonists usually end giving in the central authority. They are not powerful enough to the extent that they can transform the existing society; yet, both characters share an opposition to the state order. The creation of a dystopian hero with limited capacity coincides with the role of dystopia defined as the negative mirror of utopia. It represents the unwanted outcome of a perfect, unified and stable utopia; in this, no characters in dystopia can be the agents of a social destabilisation. In other words, the conflict between the individual and the State in dystopia implies the author's main concern with the "similarity" of people in society, as is seen in Huxley's and Orwell's work. By contrast, the writers of "critical utopia", with which Burgess is resonant, have a strong concern with "equality" and human diversity and difference in society.[7]

---

[6] Moylan (1986) states: "A central concern in the critical utopia is the awareness of limitations of the utopian tradition, so that these texts reject utopia as blueprint while preserving it as dream" (10).

[7] The sense of difference and diversity is asserted by Burgess in "Epilogue: Conflict and Confluence" of *Urgent Copy* (1968). He recalls how his experience in Malaya in 1954 constitutes a motivation for his writing: "[There] were Malays, Chinese, Bengalis, Sikhs, Tamils, Eurasians. There were today-shops, Cantonese eating-halls, open-air *sateh*-stalls, *ronggeng*-dancers, and

Starting with this standpoint, Burgess creates an active human subject who is central to the action of the novel. His text starts with a society agitated by Alex's violent crimes, and his behaviour drives the government to embark on a new social policy. Alex represents a threat which destabilises the social order, but at the same time, he makes a claim for his autonomy as well as his right to have his own moral standards. Unlike Winston Smith who eventually subordinates himself to the totalitarian society, in the end Alex wins his freedom insofar as it is granted an equal status with the government which wants his support order to win the next election. When compared with previous dystopian heroes, Burgess's protagonist is not only more developed as a character but mainly more central to the action of the novel, since his own action changes the way the ruling order acts.

The "personalistic" concern in *A Clockwork Orange* takes shape in the form of representation. The novel is written in a peculiar language called *nadsad*, which is used only by youth gangs.[8] Alex leads the reader through the novel using this particular language and, accordingly, the reader sees society through the young protagonist's anti-social consciousness. While dystopian novels, through the language issue, are likely to provide the reader with a warning about the future, Burgess's *nadsad* highlights the subjectivity of the protagonist.[9]

Consequently, the novel is less involved in offering a concrete vision of the future than previous dystopian novels were. One of the primary objectives of

---

musical gong societies. There was conflict turned by the British into a confluence. At last I could write. In the oppressive heat of the afternoon the sweat flowed. It flowed on to paper, along with words. At last I had become a novelist". (270)

[8] The creation of this particular language shows Burgess's strong interest in the linguistic experiment of Modernism (as seen in the work of James Joyce in the early part of the twentieth century). He also pays particular attention to Modernist writers' literary experiment of "the flux of separable events", as he values Iris Murdoch's novels in *The Novel Now* (1967): "In *The Flight from the Enchanter* there is a pattern imposed on the flux of separable events.... There is that residue of the inexplicable and uncontrollable which gives I. Murdoch's work distinction—magical elements, symbols, ambiguities" (126).

[9] Cf. Orwell's "New Speak" in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

dystopian narrative is to point "fearfully at the way the world is supposedly going in order to provide urgent propaganda for a change in direction" (Clute and Nicholls 360). Although Burgess sets up his London in a near future, his novel does not show what the society would be like if some deficient factors of the old society were left unaltered. Nor does his dystopia give readers a useful and effective warning that would prevent them from reaching the outcome as it is portrayed. Alex's afflicting behaviour is simply terrible enough, and the government's reaction to his crimes turns out to be violent as well. As such, *A Clockwork Orange* comprises two dystopian worlds which are equally unacceptable. This shows again that Burgess's novel marks a departure from the classic dystopian fiction and, more importantly, embodies what Fredric Jameson and Louis Marin defines as the ideal style of dystopia and utopia. The economic, social, and political changes in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (symbolized by the French and Industrial Revolutions) lead to the idea of progress towards the future. Yet, according to Jameson and Marin, utopian literature ever since has gone "wrong" since it is not "figuratively established across its referential subtext, but rather literally founded and edified on the latter's historical emplacement" (Jameson 1977: 84). Jameson, who refers to Marin's study of utopian literature, argues that utopia has to be located at a "rupture" between history and meta-history, from which the text elicits a significant meaning; but the writers of the nineteenth and of the beginning of the twentieth centuries are too preoccupied with setting up a feasible social vision as a terrestrial social praxis. Dystopia, although supposed to be the anti-thesis of utopia, reveals its affinity to utopia in terms of its didactic nature. Burgess's new approach is that he does not suggest to his readers how the future will be like if they are not cautious about the existing social conditions. There is no authentic place and time to be idealized or to be avoided, which echoes the author's statement, "we have to try to remember, that we are all, alas, much the same", i.e. pretty terrible" (*1985* 102). The two opposing nightmarish worlds in *A Clockwork Orange* deny each other's consensual validation of judgments and, therefore, interrupt any movements to form the foundation of single authorised point of view. Burgess's satirical portrayal of the undesirable society keeps moral and ethical debates open.

OPPOSING TWO DYSTOPIAS

Based on his own critical approach to previous utopian and dystopian novels, Burgess creates his own narrative by combining Huxley's scepticism about science and technology and Orwell's moral concern.[1] These two themes are both integrated into Burgess's work, which focuses on the "personalistic" nature of dystopia, namely, on the issue of "what happens to a specific subject or character" (Jameson 1994: 56). Subsequently, Burgess's narrative evolves around accidents happening to the defiant protagonist, who is central to the two dystopian worlds. His novel does not merely give a warning to us. Rather, it provokes reflection upon our ethical and moral sense, making us consider how society should be organised, and who are the proper social agents to stabilise the whole social system and order. When the two types of society presented to us are both unacceptable, it is the reader's work to reckon with the third alternative society.

Burgess starts with the portrayal of London in a near future, in which ferocious teenage rebels freely commit violent crimes. This may be interpreted as a world of "free will", but what the young gangs establish is clearly a dystopian society, insofar as the society is dominated by violence, cruelty, and a lack of respect. Their merciless actions are so overlooked that the protagonist Alex cannot help feeling, "Everything as easy as kiss-my-sharries. Still, the nights was still very young" (*A Clockwork Orange* 14). An old homeless man, who is attacked by Alex and his buddies, complains that science and technology bring about no utopia. He questions: "What sort of a world is it at all? Men on the moon and men spinning round the earth like it might be midges round a lamp, and there's not no attention paid to earthly law nor order no more" (15). While the advancement of technology produces a comfortable life for people, making it possible to watch the same TV program all over the world, it is unable to prevent some crazy and violent behaviour of ferocious young gangs (*A Clockwork Orange* 17).

---

[1] Cf. Northrop Frye's argument (1965): "Most utopia-writers follow either More (and Plato) in stressing the legal structure of their societies, or Bacon in stressing its technological power" (27).

Making such an abhorrent youth the main character has some implications. In *A Clockwork Orange*, the youth constitutes the main character, as it is situated in a specific social position which makes it critical against the status quo. This position of the youth is a transitory state between childhood dependence and adult responsibility. On one hand, the youth is at a formative stage of development, "where attitudes and values become anchored to ideologies and remained fixed in this mould for life" (Barker 319). On the other hand, its ambiguous position between childhood and adulthood is the cause for a rebellious consciousness, dissatisfied with established social norms and protocols. The targets of Alex are often such social institutions as the State, school, and home, which represent the dominant powers of society.

Adolescence is a moment of rupture between childhood and the adult stage. The youth can be a threat if their hostility to society may destabilise the social order, norms and habits. According to D. Sibley (1995), young people demonstrate "the act of drawing the line in the construction of discrete categories" and interrupt "what is naturally continuous" (34-5). In *A Clockwork Orange*, Alex gives some insight into the world of adults, and associates it with inert, boring, submissive habits. In Burgess's Britain, all adults, except those who are ill or need to bring up children, must go out "rabitting". Alex's father is employed at the dye works, and his mother works at one of the "Statemarts", filling up the shelves with tinned soup and beans *(A Clockwork Orange* 31). The term "rabbit" is a modified form of the Russian verb *rabotat*, and the adaptation of this word into the language *nadsat* coins the word *rab* meaning "slave", which is not far from the English word *robot* meaning "mechanical slave" (Aggeler 171). Alex's parents are good illustrations of citizens who are subordinated to a systematised, mechanised society. Alex accuses his parents of complying to this life passively and of having no desire to revolt. The destruction of the painting about the "good old municipal" society (which is in the basement of Alex's accommodation) represents a symbolic rebellion against their inert society of adults (*A Clockwork Orange* 28); the obsolete painting expresses the old dream of constructing an ideal world, which was generated out of the citizens' hope and belief in human perfectibility, progress, and harmony. The rebellious hero refuses to

subordinate himself to the boredom and routine of everyday life. In doing so, Alex demonstrates his "free will" through crime, violence and delinquency. He refuses to go to school, destroys public buildings and commits criminal assault and robbery, to the extent that Mr Deltoid asks Alex in confusion: "You've got a good home here, good loving parents. You've got not too bad of brain. Is it some devil that crawl inside you?" (*A Clockwork Orange* 33) The violence of Alex and his friends manifests an act of assertion, a force to break through the established morals and nullified conventions of adults.

The peculiar language and fashion of the protagonist, which demonstrate the shocking appearance of the irrational, chaotic and absurd, similarly articulate a desire to subvert the world of order. Dick Hebdige (1988) notices that the youth founds itself within and across the discourse of "trouble" and "fun". Alex's role as a troublemaker in the interesting fashion interrupts the public consciousness in everyday life. Paul E. Willis in *Profane Culture* (1978) considers that youth culture to be a positive move in the search for its own potential inside capitalism.[2] He writes:

> It is the worst productions out of the dead hand of the market which surrounded oppressed and minority groups; what capitalism has rejected, thrown aside, thoughtlessly produced or carelessly sustained to keep the cynical commercial penny turning. But because they are surrounded by plastic erstaz and the detritus of the bourgeoisie, there is for all that a mode desperate need not to be duped, but to find meaning and potential within what they find—they have nothing else. (5)

With his unusual fashion and language, Alex manifests the will to gain his autonomy and craves his own values in opposition to the monolithic mass culture. He destroys consumer products; he wants to be, not the victim, but the rebel against capitalism which is apt to make the individuals look identical and uniform. Alex offers direct resistance to social and cultural norms, and denounces the dominant discourses of the social order. When Mr Deltoid asks him what causes such evil nature in his young

---

[2] According to Willis, youth culture also reveals that the dominant class in society, i.e. the group of people defined as creators of culture, is also itself victim of their own illusions and false recognition of their own ideology.

character, Alex counterattacks by pointing out that human history is nothing more than the record of barbarianism:

> But, brothers, this biting of their toe-nails over what is the *cause* of badness is what turns me into a fine laughing malchick. They don't go into the cause of *goodness*, so why the other shop? ... But the non-self cannot have the bad, meaning they of the government and the judges and the schools cannot allow the bad because they cannot allow the self. And is not our modern history, my brothers, the story of brave malenky selves fighting these big machines? (*A Clockwork Orange* 34)

While public opinion blames the delinquency of the youth, Alex refutes their ideas by sarcastically wondering about the collective responsibility of society in wars and its abominations. The authority of moral judgement is threatened when violence at a personal level is compared with violence at public level. This question discloses contradictions and incongruities in the discourses of those who exercise power.

For some critics, the youth is deemed as source of a utopian desire: "Youth has become an ideological signifier charged with utopian images of the future even as it is feared by others as a potential threat to existing norms and regulations" (Barker 321). The youth is not only a state of transition but also "a privileged site" in which they enhance their sense of difference (ibid. 321). Through violence and his aesthetic taste, Alex expresses his difference as well as individuality, through which he implicitly aims to deconstruct and transform the existing society into a new one. Thus, the youth has the potential power to overthrow a central authority. In this respect, Alex may pertain to the group of dystopian protagonists. For, the main protagonist of a dystopian fiction is opposed to the established order, as we see in Winston's challenge to Oceania in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. He is against the totality and unification of his society, in which individual's free will is totally expunged. Through the portrayal of dystopias, the writers question the necessary degree of the consensual agreements on morality, rationality, and normality (Butler 121). If a primary moral discourse is bound up with a collective authority, then there should be a "second order" of moral discourse residing within the individual. The conflict of the main character with a centralised society, in dystopian novels, illustrates the

struggle between the primary and secondary orders of morality. In *A Clockwork Orange*, Alex doubts the authenticity of the *primary* moral discourse, and makes assertion in favour of "a second order", questioning in particular the *primary* criterion of value judgements. Alex's violence, along with his unusual fashion taste, radically questions the possibility of having a one-dimensional ideology and negates the feasibility of founding one universal critical standpoint. The presence of teenage rebels thwarts "the sought-after homogeneity of this engineered, perhaps one-world society" (Willis 53). This issue is all the more stressed when Alex is transformed into an ideal human through scientific means and exhibited in all his "goodness".

****

Despite Alex's keen insight into social contradictions within coded value-systems of the dominant culture, his ruthless, problematic world is certainly unpalatable. In Burgess's Britain, the government thus starts undertaking a new policy of controlling the social disorder. It disavows the conventional forms of punishment as they have never been the sufficient solution for reducing the number of crimes. A more effective means to fight against the behaviour of young gangs is sought for, and the government consequently has recourse to the developed version of "aversion therapy". The effect of this method, called the Ludovico treatment, is expected to be a change of comportment, and Alex, put in jail after committing a murder, is the first subject for the new experiment. Its outcome is a success; the violent troublemaker is impeccably transformed into an "ideal" citizen, who is disgusted by all kinds of violence and wrong-doings. Witnessing the successful effects of Alex's treatment, the Minister of the Interior proudly claims:

> What a change is here, gentlemen, from the wretched hoodlum the State committed to unprofitable punishment some two years ago, unchanged after two years. Unchanged, do I say? Not quite. Prison taught him the false smile, the rubbed hands of hypocrisy, the fawning greased obsequious leer. Other vices it taught him, as well as confirming him in those he had long practised before. (*A Clockwork Orange* 97)

Alex's rehabilitation is exhibited as a perfect result reached through scientific means. The dystopian society is now over, according to the politicians, and it is replaced with a kind of "utopian" society, in which all frightening realities have disappeared.

However, this ideal society is rejected by the chaplain, who holds that the price of this paradise is the disappearance of all things which previously made men and women human beings. As he claims: "Goodness comes from within.... Goodness is something chosen. When a man cannot choose he ceases to be a man" (*A Clockwork Orange* 67). In his view, the Ludovico treatment only shows that the subject's human instincts are systematically destroyed and re-created in another form like a robot. The chaplain is thus opposed to the government's new policy, which violates the free will and rights of humans. He fears that a society, in which one is forced to surrender one's own identity to the State order, foreshadows the rise of totalitarianism, i.e. another form of dystopia.

Burgess's illustration of dystopia with this scientific experiment is not a pure product of his imagination. The Ludovico treatment in the novel is a satire of the "new behaviourists", whose aversion therapies is influential in the 1960s and 70s.[3] Burgess deliberately includes this criticism of behaviourism. In *1985* (1978), Burgess writes about the historical contexts of the 1960s. He describes how the collision between youths and the State was a serious social problem. Many state policy and opinion makers supported any kind of powerful method to stop the growing youthful aggression: "[It] was in Britain...that respectable people began to murmur about the growth of juvenile delinquency and suggest, having read certain sensational articles in certain newspapers, that the young criminals who abounded...were a somehow inhuman breed and required inhuman treatment" (Burgess 1978: 91). Subsequently, intellectuals and politicians were in favour of the scientific treatment launched by

---

[3] Some literary critics show that the Ludovico treatment in Burgess's novel is based on real scientific experiments in the US during the 1960s and 70s. For example, John Stinson (1991) writes: "By the mid-1970s aversive conditioning was making headway in the U.S. penal system: some inmates were given shots of apomorphine, inducing violent vomiting and dry retching.... Such practices were generally successfully opposed by the American Civil Liberties Union and other groups as 'cruel and unusual punishment'; *A Clockwork Orange* was almost always at least mentioned in media reports about litigation connected with this troubling but ethically complex issue" (55).

behavioural technologists. In particular, behavioural science is represented by B. F. Skinner and it was highly celebrated in Europe and the U.S. around this time.[4] Skinner invalidates the previous works of the environmentalists, such as Robert Owen's utopian project at New Harmony in the U.S. (and also at New Lanark in Scotland) in the nineteenth century. The new behaviourist criticise Owen's project of constructing an artificial environment in which good behaviour is encouraged under constant surveillance. In his view, Owen's project is inadequate and inefficient and, therefore, Skinner maintains that a person must be changed within. Following the scientist Pavlov's creed, "How like a dog!", Skinner puts human beings on the same level as dogs in the sense that he believes in the total manipulation of human psychology.

It must be acknowledged that Skinner is also renowned as the author of a utopian novel, *The Walden Two* (1949). Although the novel was first published in the same year as Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it gained popularity on its reprint during the 1960s and was considered to be one of the important utopian writings. The success of Skinner's novel is closely related to the growing public interest in aversion therapy for which the author is originally famous. In *Beyond Freedom and Dignity* (1972), Skinner celebrates the achievement of new behaviourists and states that "autonomous man—the inner man, the homunaulus, the possessing demon, the man defended by the literatures of freedom and dignity" can be abolished because consciousness is a "social production" (192). The methods of former behaviourists are inadequate, Skinner asserts, because they leave too much freedom to each individual. In contrast, the project launched by new behaviourists intends the complete manipulation of human psychology, such that human beings progress towards self-control. Skinner announces that science offers these "exciting possibilities". He writes:

> It is hard to imagine a world in which people live together without quarrelling, maintain themselves by producing the food, shelter, and clothing they need, enjoy themselves and contribute to the enjoyment

---

[4] See Aggeler (172-3).

> of others in art, music, literature, and games, consume only a reasonable part of the resources of the world and add as little as possible it its pollution, bear no more children than can be raised decently, continue to explore the world around them and discover better ways of dealing with it, and come to know themselves accurately and, therefore, manage themselves effectively. Yet all this is possible, and even the slightest sign of progress should bring a kind of change which in traditional terms would be said to assuage wounded vanity, offset a sense of hopelessness or nostalgia, correct the impression that "we neither can nor need to do anything for ourselves", and promote a "sense of freedom and dignity" by building "a sense of confidence and worth". In other words, it should abundantly reinforce those who have been induced by their culture to work for its survival. (1972: 214)

Skinner and other behaviourists assert emphatically that their theory and achievement in science leads to a utopian world, i.e. the world of perfection, stability, tranquillity and totality which does not require any further alternations.

Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* is written in order to counterattack Skinner's utopianism. Burgess distrusts this Pavlonian conditioning which destroys free will and human rights. He attacks this new scientific method and those behavioural technologists who have no doubt that goodness must be imposed on human beings by mechanical devices. According to Burgess, a society conditioned by science and technology is similar to an Orwellian dystopia, in which "Freedom is Slavery" is realised. Modern science offers the dangerous possibility of constructing a society in which "man ceases to be man when he is incapable of squalor, shame, guilt and suffering" (41). In the novel, the author expresses his fear that the development of modern science ultimately leads to an authoritarian state, in which "the individual has lost all his rights of moral choice and is subject to the arbitrary power of some ruling body" (*1985* 9). In opposition to this distorted "utopian" project, Burgess plots for the failure of the Ludovico treatment. In *A Clockwork Orange*, the government's new policy is eventually invalidated because of a contingent accident. During the therapy session, the scientists come across a problem involving Alex's music taste. Ultimately, it is Beethoven's the Ninth (i.e. Alex's favourite piece of music) that causes both the final failure of the treatment and the change in government's policy associated with it. Alex's passion for music induces his victory,

since it makes him regain his former sensibility. Burgess's thematic concern with the freedom of will overpowers the totalitarian control by the government and the behaviourists.

A Clockwork Orange presents a new approach to the creation of dystopian fiction. The novel is comprised of opposing dystopias, i.e. the violence of the youth and the totalitarian state policy. The composition of the novel's structure signifies the absence of a transcendentally authoritative character pervading the whole society. In the end, the two types of dystopias are both implicitly rejected and, therefore, both fail to be predominant. In this respect, Burgess's novel departs from the conventional forms and structure of dystopian narratives. The significant difference of Burgess's text is the absence of an absolute totalitarian figure, i.e. the figure of the great Inquisitor like Orwell's Big Brother or Huxley's Controller. In contrast, Burgess shows two discourses of power, which compete and clash with each other. John Stinson (1991) states:

> Multifaceted and multipronged, Burgess's rich fictions elude both labels and quick estimations of their worth. Their essence is best captured if we note the essential clash of opposites that lies at their very heart, generally imparting energy, depth, and complexity, although producing some occasional confusion among critics as well. (19)

An almost equivalent relationship between the young rebel Alex and the State destabilises the typical structure of dystopian novels. Accordingly, Burgess's novel raises the tension between social order and individual freedom. The recalcitrant young hero is a social menace, as long as he tries to destabilise the social order and regularity. His violence is hazardous in light of its opposition with moral and ethical values. However, the government's new policy deprives humans of their free will, and as such, is as dangerous as Alex's violence. As a result, the text gives the readers no clue to a foundation for clear moral value. The protagonist, unlike Winston and the Savage, does not represent a standard to which the readers can identify themselves. Moreover, the government's excessive reliance on aversion therapy provokes in us as much as uncertainty and anxiety as Alex's violence causes.

Burgess's novel does not seem to seek the meanings of truth and universality, since the conflicts between these two unwanted worlds make it impossible to trace the source of a single moral judgement. *A Clockwork Orange* merely questions *a degree* of universality, such that the state awkwardly attempts to reconcile the individual desire for freedom with a collective requirement for order.

The popularity of Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* owes much to Stanley Kubrick's film version (1972). The success of the film comes partly from the director's use of the American version. The novel was first published in Britain by William Heinemann Ltd and was then released by W. W. Norton Inc in the United States (Burgess 1987: vi). Burgess had an argument with the American publishing house over the publication of his novel in the US. The disputed point was the treatment of the last chapter. The American publisher disagreed with Burgess and decided to release the novel without the final chapter for the reason that "the original version, showing as it does a capacity for regeneration in even the most depraved soul, was a kind of capitulation to the British Pelagian spirit, whereas the Augustinian Americans were tough enough to accept an image of unregenerable man" (Burgess 1987: vi-vii). Besides, the American edition had a glossary which was added to the novel without the permission of Burgess (Aggeler 172).[1] Kubrick preferred the American version, and thus the ending of the film was different from Burgess's original novel.[2] Consequently, this decision strengthens the depth and complexity represented by the novel.

In the last chapter (Chapter 21) of the original version, Alex achieves spiritual maturity. The young hooligan grows up, becomes morally aware of his role in society, and intends to found a family. According to Burgess, Alex's final conversion signals "a demonstration of the capacity of human nature to change". He adds:

> Man is defined by his capacity to choose courses of moral action. If he chooses good, he must have the possibility of choosing evil instead: evil is a theological necessity. I was also saying that it is more acceptable for us to perform evil acts than to be conditioned artificially into an ability only to perform what is socially acceptable. (1987: vii)

---

[1] According to Aggeler, the degree of accuracy in the translation of the *nadsad* language into normal English is questionable (172).

[2] Burgess later presented a play version, which is much more loyal to the original novel than Kubrick's film is. About the context of the play, see the Appendix of the thesis.

Burgess thinks of the suppression of the final chapter as being "harmful", because it neglects the essential subject of the novel. Moreover, he interprets this as a destruction of the arithmology of the novel: the book is composed of twenty-one chapters, themselves divided into three sections of equal size. Besides, and twenty-one symbolises the age of maturity in Britain (1987: vi). In response, Burgess in the preface to the 1988 American edition, "A Clockwork Orange Resucked", portrays himself as an Alex-like victim, being conditioned and reduced to an automaton which performs what the society of advanced capitalism demands.[3]

Despite the author's view that Alex's new maturity is the required conclusion, it is possible to view the final chapter as destroying much of the effect of the novel, in particular in terms of its portrayal of the youth in revolt against the social order. Undoubtedly, the violence enjoyed by the young gangs is unacceptable. Nevertheless, Alex's criticisms of the passive life of adults and of the hypocritical collective morality must not be underestimated. In this sense, the final chapter reduces the protagonist to be not very different from his parents, insofar as, being mature, he joins the dominant class. Then the youth is merely treated as a transitional phase in his spiritual development.

The problem over Chapter 21 also pertains to the effect of the *nadsad* language. Alex's language is the symbol of an errant and rebel action. It serves as a powerful weapon destabilising the legitimacy of the central authority and society. Dystopian heroes in general struggle to construct their own language in order to gain the freedom to communicate their own ideas. We have seen that in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* the totalitarian regime aims to control people's minds through the manipulation of language, as embodied in the Newspeak scheme. The "unorthodox" Winston Smith fights to preserve the old-styled language in his diary. David Sisk (1997) argues that, while language in a society is supposed to express "intellectual capability and moral behaviour", "unorthodox" languages, such as regional or ethnic dialects and slang, are "a supremely powerful rallying point for national and cultural groups who wish to [emphasise] both their heritage and their autonomy" (12). In this

---

[3] The final chapter was not restored in the U.S. until 1988.

respect, Alex's language is a counterattack against the established social order, also expressing a desire for autonomy and the sense of difference. The novel shows the difficulty in communicating between Alex and adults. For instance, let us see the scene in which the Discharge Officer asks Alex what he would like to do after his release:

> "Where will you go when you leave here?"
> ....
> "Oh, I shall go home. Back to my pee and em".
> "Your—?" He did not get nadsat-talk at all.... (*A Clockwork Orange* 87)

Because of his unusual language, the parties do not reach any consensus. The Officer does not understand him at all. The effect of Alex's language is not only to negate the social and moral order in his world. It is also, more importantly, effective on the reader's consciousness. Unlike the Officer in the novel, we understand that he wants to see his father and mother. The understanding between the protagonist and the reader proves the weighty effect of the novel which few dystopian texts have achieved. Alex's language makes us realise how much our way of thinking is bounded by the established ways of expression and representation. At first, Alex's language disrupts our habitual reading process because of the difficulty in understanding it. Then the reading becomes easier and easier, meaning that the reader is able to understand Alex's language and thought from inside. The *nadsad* language and views expressed in it eventually lead us to another way of considering life, when we are aware that perceptions of the world and life can be represented in another way. In this sense, the protagonist's abandon of the *nadsad* language in the final chapter ruins the role of this language in the novel.

In contrast, the power of the novel is strengthened by Stanley Kubrick, since his film does not take the final chapter into account. Burgess refers to the film as "Stanley Kubrick's *Clockwork Orange*", which imlies that the film refashions the novel and acquires a new status. The issues introduced by the film put accents on different yet still important aspects of the text. The cinematic techniques and aesthetic aims explored by Kubrick achieve this purpose. Despite the lack of Chapter

21, or because of the lack of this chapter, Kubrick's film succeeds in drawing the political and social concerns from Burgess's text and strengthens the complexity and depth of the novel. His film becomes a social and political rebellion when the violence in the work is combined with his aestheticism.

Kubrick's film depends on visual images. The image of the prison is worthy of examination, since it evokes some similarity with utopian architecture. The architecture of the prison in Kubrick's film recalls, for instance, the Maison centrale at Rennes, built in 1877, whose anonymously dispersed mechanism of power is probed by Michel Foucault in his *Discipline and Punish* (1975). Foucault also investigates how architecture and power are strongly related in grandiose utopian visions from the eighteenth century. In an interview with Paul Rabinow, entitled "Space, Knowledge, and Power", the French historian argues how architecture begins to partake of political aims in the eighteenth century, in order "to penetrate, to stimulate, to regulate, and to render almost automatic all the mechanisms of society" (*The Foucault Reader* 242). Since then, space has become fundamental in the exercise of power, and Foucault thinks of this as typical of a utopian society.[4] Architecture expresses the human desire to create "stable and long-lasting order", and this enterprise is thoroughly stressed in utopian construction. According to Thomas A. Markus (1985), architecture is a symbol for political or economic power, and becomes "a way of reproducing power structures, with the backing of a legitimising ideology, whether that of the church, State, or the laws of the 'free market'" (Markus 9). Understood in this way, the resemblance between the prison and utopian architecture, as displayed in Kubrick's film, implies a conflicting duality that both represent "the need *for* and dangers *of* systematic order" (Markus 9). The film illustrates the "paradoxical power" of utopian architecture as Foucault's and Markus's analyses infer that utopian architecture stands on the ambiguous verge on a "humanising and liberating" order or on "oppressive and nightmarish" one (Markus 9). Thus, Kubrick's film represents the prison as, on the one hand, a necessary place for securing peace and order in society, and, on the other, a place of oppression and

---

[4] One example is the Enlightenment project of Chaux designed by C.N. Ledoux in the 1770s.

nightmare for the prisoners. These contradictory implications are stressed by Kubrick in his interview with the film critic Michel Ciment:

> Certainly one of the most challenging and difficult social problems we face today is, how can the State maintain the necessity degree of control over society without becoming repressive, and how can it achieve this in the face of an increasingly impatient electorate who are beginning to regard legal and political solutions as too slow? The State sees the spectre looming ahead of terrorism and anarchy, and this increases the risk of its over-reaction and a reduction in our freedom. As with everything else in life, it is a matter of groping for the right balance, and a certain amount of luck. (qtd. in Ciment 163)

The audience would not be able to see the whole image of the prison if the movement-image of the film were fixed by the position of a single observer such as Alex. Moreover, the inhuman eye of the camera helps us to grasp the mechanical aspect of the prison independently of the individuals in it. As such, the inhuman eye of the camera liberates the audience from a fixed view-point and, accordingly, helps us to be free from a single notion of life.

In Kubrick's *A Clockwork Orange*, the viewpoint of the camera is also used to depict power relationships. The film describes a hidden ambition for power in each person. For instance, when Alex becomes aware that his friends (or droogs) want to exclude him from the group, Kubrick uses long-angle shots in the subsequent combat scene in order to enhance Alex's rage and will for power. Conversely, when Alex is put in the position of a victim, in the scene at the Police HQ, we see a despised Alex being looked down upon by Mr Deltoid and the Inspector, who represent power. Likewise, when a nearly nude girl tests Alex's lust after sessions of aversion therapy, Kubrick cuts to an overhead shot, showing Alex trying to reach for the girl's breasts and falling away defeated. In addition, the film shows a remarkable contrast between the loser and the winner; Alex, defeated and feeling ill because of his treatment, crouches in pain in the shadow of the spotlight, while the State's professional provocateur and the girl smile in the light as if they would confirm the power and victory of the State.

More importantly, the camera eye is used to suggest that the darkness in each human being is hardly distinguishable. In the final scene in which Alex is reconciled with the State, their alliance is stressed. Don Daniels (1972-3) attributes this final scene to the director's concerns:

> Alex De Large must not only conquer his world. He must unify it, no matter how distorted the final vision. His habit coincides with Kubrick's attempts to give a motion picture a complexity of visual coherence, to create a system of visual correspondences that will illuminate its theme. (44)

The film not only articulates that Alex is a victim but also conveys that he is a "restricted scale" of the State's "coarse institutional and indiscriminately committed immoralities" (Daniels 44). In the early part of the film, we find Alex, with his desire to unify the world, excluding those who are improper to his society; such people as the tramp, the radical, or the old are all forced to be outside of his world. Likewise, we see how the State vindicates violent practices as a necessary instrument for the punishment and exclusion of some citizens (such as the turbulent youths and those of political opposition). The similarity and equality between Alex and the State is symbolically expressed by a shaking of hands. "In our consciousness we are all potential Alexes", Kubrick says (qtd. in Ciment 158). The director's statement echoes and further radicalises Burgess's view that "we have to try to remember, that we are all, alas, much the same, i.e. pretty terrible" (*1985* 102). All the characters in his film are described as inherently evil. When Alex is brutally revenged by the group of tramps, some visual images highlight the monstrous faces of old tramps in close-up. These faces are barely different from the malevolent faces of Alex's former buddies, who now take advantage of their social status as policemen and enjoy attacking Alex in the aftermath of the Ludovico treatment. Thus, no one is innocent in Kubrick's film. The film reveals the banal, decadent lifestyle of the Cat Lady as well as the pathetic life of Alex's parents. Neither is the teacher, Mr Deltoid, portrayed as a sincere, honest man; while speaking in admonitory tone, he nudges the near-naked boy in sexual-toned behaviour. The priest is also portrayed ambiguously; when Alex is exhibited before an audience after the completion of his rehabilitation,

the film shows the hero standing between the priest and the Minister of the Interior. We see Alex being taken round his shoulders by these two human figures of opposing ideologies, as John E. Fitzerald in *Catholic News* (1971) states:

> Such brainwashing, organic and psychological, is a weapon that totalitarians in State, Church or society might wish to use for an easier good, even at the cost human rights and dignity. Redemption is a complicated thing and change must be motivated from within rather than imposed from without if moral values are to be held. (4)

Furthermore, Mr Alexander's aim is pictured as being not very different from the State's. The dissident writer aims to use Alex as a propaganda device for his political activity, though his original plan is eventually subordinated to his lunatic fantasies of torture and revenge. In the face of such characters, our perception of humanity is uncertain; in this sense, the film questions our moral interpretations of society. Undoubtedly, Alex is a menace to society, and his violent crimes must be punished. Yet it must be also acknowledged that he is, as the director comments, "always completely honest in his first-person narrative, perhaps painfully so" (qtd. in Ciment 157). We also find him full of emotions and sensitivity. Alex is the one who is strenuously critical of the shrewd capitalists; he even honestly talks to us, "Well, the next morning I had to say good-bye to the old Staja, and I felt a malenky bit sad as you always will when you have to leave a place you've like got used to", when he leaves for the hospital to undertake the new scientific treatment (*A Clockwork Orange* 77). Alex looks more humane than the other characters in the text. Thus, his role enriches the moral complexity and depth of the film in its unanswered questions about human nature.

The ending of the film, which is loyal to the American version, reinforces the film's rejection of fixed meaning and interpretation. Alexander Walker (1999) values the indeterminacy conveyed through the film:

> As the end credits unroll, 'Singin' in the Rain' is quoted back at us with its violent associations, though whether it will be Alex's theme song for fresh atrocities that now carry the stamp of State approval, or whether it will again betray him to his enemies, is anybody's guess. Kubrick is certainly not

supplying an answer. (221)

The equality of the protagonist and the State is symbolically expressed by their shaking hands in the end, which simultaneously evokes some bizarre and frightening reverberations through the camera's third point of view. The power of the camera-eye, which is not attached to the human emotions, distances us from the subjective or the objective perspective, so that we can hardly grasp onto any fixed meanings or an agreed way of thinking. The ambiguity of the ending prompts the question of whether Alex goes back to his former violent life or becomes an ally of the State. This leads us to another question: whether there is any possibility of escape from, or improvement of, this dystopian world. The indeterminacy of the film's ending demonstrates the idea that "art has no ethical purpose" (Hughs 1971). Kubrick explores a concept of art, which rejects the nineteenth-century notion that art contains ethical purposes. Rather, as the camera skilfully liberates our perception from fixed principles, to the end the film dissolves any definitive answers. In Gilles Deleuze's words, this is a cinematic appeal for an "Open whole", for a flow of differing differences: "[If] the whole is not givable it is because it is the Open, and because its nature is to change constantly, or to give rise to something new, in short, to endure" (1986: 9). The film, as a composition of various movements, does not reinforce our conventional view of life, nor tries to convey any alternative ideological messages. Kubrick's work leaves the conflict between the individual and society unanswered. On the one hand, the final words of Alex, "I was cured 'all right'", mark the failure of the Pavlovian conditioning which destroys our free will. On the other hand, his final words imply the revival of the hero's evil nature, bringing us back to the original social concern of violence. Again, we are faced with the difficulty of reconciling the individual's freedom with social order. Thus, Kubrick presents "a goalless society, a spiritual wilderness" (Walker 209). In consequence, the interpretation of the film and the judgement on ethical issues in the film are all entrusted to each viewer.[5] The recurring question in the novel, "What's it

[5] Kubrick's film in this respect demonstrates a certain affinity with postmodern uncertainty and ambiguity as seen in John Berger's *G.*, a postmodern novel: "This disjunctive, unfinished quality

going to be then?" echoes after the film, more significantly than in the novel, and provokes in each viewer to make an individual moral choice.[6]

Back to Burgess's novel, the iterative phrase, "What's going to be then, eh?", may give some additional weight to Burgess's perception of man: "Accept that man is imperfect, that good and evil exist and you will not, like Wells, expect too much from him" (1987: 39). His statement needs to be considered in relation to the following question: if the environment is constructed by "imperfect" humans, and if human nature is not wholly changed by science, then how can we solve the conflict between the individual autonomy and the state order? And can we explore utopia? The question can be developed into the enquiry undertaken by Michel Foucault in *Technologies of the Self* (1988): "What are we in our actuality?" (145) In "Subject and Power", he proposes a new theory of human nature:

> Maybe the target nowadays is not to discover what we are but to refuse what we are. We have to imagine and build up what we could be to get rid of this kind of political 'double bind', which is the simultaneous individualization and totalization of modern power structures.... We have to promote new forms of subjectivity through the refusal of this kind of individuality that has been imposed on us for several centuries. (1994: 336)

While the power figure in an Orwellian state represses those below, from top to bottom, Burgess's novel portrays our society as "the multiplicity of force relations immanent in the sphere in which they operate and which constitute their own organization" (Foucault, *The History of Sexuality* 92). Unlike Orwell's text, which criticises the unified system of totalitarianism in which a small group controls the whole society, Burgess seems rather to reconfigure the established notion of power hierarchy, showing numerous avenues through which the power can be exercised.

---

challenges readers to establish an order which the text does not entirely provide for them. Far from finding, as in conventional fiction, a coherent, structured refuge from the shapelessness of life, readers of *G.*are—as if at a Brecht play—bereft of secure containment within illusion, and forced to take responsibility, conceptually at least, for the reshaping of reality beyond the page. (Stevenson 1991: 24)

[6] A kind of "open-ending" as defined by the novelist E.M. Forster can be associated with Kubrick's way of ending. Tom Moylan (2000) considers that this "open-ending" infers a utopian spirit; as it gives "no answers but rather [creates] at least a minimal 'space of possibilities' that evokes a potentially utopian horizon" (160).

Such a perspective on life, as explored by Kubrick, indicates that his dystopian novel takes account of the issues inherent to the individual.

Chapter III
"It's an impossibility I want":
A Self-reflexive Utopia in Alasdair Gray's Lanark

Alasdair Gray's *Lanark: A Life in 4 Books* is published in 1981, after the author has devoted almost ten years to its creation. His novel is characterised by its complexity and fecundity; as its subtitle suggests, it is comprised of four books which are divided into two apparently different stories. Books 1 and 2 are about the life of a young man named Duncan Thaw, and both books are framed in a realistic narrative. The other two books describe the life of a man called Lanark, and the story is framed in the fantastic mode. *Lanark* also includes several literary devices and experiments. For instance, the novel is built on an illogical structure, such that the novel starts with Book 3, followed by Books 1, 2, and 4. Each book is introduced by a minute, elaborate painting by Gray (as he is a professional painter). In addition, *Lanark* exhibits several literary devices, such as typographical experiments, a list of footnotes. As well, the Epilogue is not at the end but inserted in the middle of the novel, and is comprised of experimental devices such as a caption on the top of each page, which is supposed to summarise the narrative of the page, and the "Index of Plagiarisms". The author playfully explains in the text that he intentionally set up the "Index of Plagiarisms" so that critics can save time in analysing the text.

Because of such characteristics, the novel has been interpreted in various ways: Lanark as a contemporary Scottish novel, as a dystopian novel, and as a postmodern novel. Isobel Murray and Bob Tait in *The Modern Scottish Novel* (1984) state that *Lanark* is "the most exuberantly unusual and inventive work of fiction to have appeared in Scotland during the entire period" (219). Randall Stevenson (1991) argues, among others, that "the playful list of references and plagiarisms shows Gray highly self-conscious about using self-conscious forms of fiction: postmodernism, once largely directed by the urge to parody and subvert conventional forms of writing, becomes in its turn a recognised, accepted form to be parodied and played

with itself" (55).[1] Moreover, *Lanark* is highly estimated by Douglas Gifford as "best of great surrealist and dystopian fiction throughout the world" (229). He holds that "*Lanark* is not beggared, but enriched by comparison with *Gulliver's Travels, Don Quixote, The Green Isle of the Great Deep, 1984*, Kafka—and yet it's undeniably Scottish in character" (230). Despite Gifford's positive comment on the text, *Lanark* has barely been examined in the field of utopian and dystopian writings. Yet the assessment of the novel as a postmodern, Scottish novel provides us some inspiring perspectives for the construction of utopia and dystopian novels.

This chapter will firstly focus on the "place" of dystopia in Gray's novel, which is argued in terms of the social and cultural contexts of Scotland. In other words, Gray sets up his dystopia nowhere but "here" in Scotland. This implies the scale down of dystopia, since Gray emphases more local and personal issues than social and political matters. The second section will examine *Lanark*'s plot, which deals with the protagonist's repetitive attempts to escape from his dystopia; the hero's successive failures show that the object of the novel is to describe an endless process, rather than the result. The final section of this chapter will explain that Gray is mainly interested in describing the protagonist's auto-reflexive thought and consciousness in relation to the reader's imagination; as such, the novel implies the importance of self-reflection as a key to construct a better society.

THE "PLACE" OF DYSTOPIA

Books 1 and 2 pertain to Duncan Thaw's life from his childhood to adolescence. The books evolve around the conflict between the protagonist, who has an audacious ambition to be a great painter, and the society which crushes his dream. What dominates Duncan's anguish is the difficulty of dealing with his power of imagination. His growing discontent with his own life can then be read in terms of social and cultural problems inherent to Scotland.

---

[1] Cf. Ricard Todd's argument about the novels written by Gray and Martin Amis (1990). See also Dominique Costa's essay (1994).

Because of his incredible talent, Duncan Thaw is offered a scholarship to the Art School of Glasgow. Despite his dream to be a socially-celebrated painter, his work is neither understood nor valued by others for the reason that his works are too removed from "reality". His English teacher rejects Duncan's imagination in his writings and asks him to write about "something more commonplace" (*Lanark* 154). Duncan faces the same problem in his paintings. In the class of still-life painting, the instructor is dismayed at Duncan's works. While he asks him to draw what he sees, Duncan rejects this suggestion and instead asserts his own definition of "reality": "The shell only seems delicate and simple because it's smaller than we are. To the fish inside it was a suit of armour, a house, a moving fortress" (229). Eventually, Duncan is expelled from the school as he is accused of having a bad influence on other students. What he paints is, from others' points of view, merely irrational; his paintings are nothing more than "ugly distortions" of reality (280). Nevertheless the protagonist moves on to fight against this social and theoretical prejudice by embarking upon a huge project of Genesis mural in Cowlairs Parish Church. Yet, here again, Duncan's project is eventually rejected in the community. He fails to achieve his project and his ambition to be a socially accepted painter remains unattainable. He instead faces, repeatedly, the sense of futility of seeking such an ideal. Throughout his life, he is never able to complete a piece of work. Ultimately he gives himself up to despair and tries to escape from this earthly world by making a suicide.

Behind Duncan's unsettled difficulties in dealing with his imagination there lies a dilemma shared by writers in Scotland for a long period. Exploring imagination through artistic work is deemed as an "impossible dream" in Scottish society, in which the doctrine of Calvinism represents the backbone of political, moral, and cultural power for almost four hundred years.[2] The isolation caused by Duncan's

---

[2] A.I.C. Heron among others, writes about this religious background as follows: "The main lines of Calvin's teaching have nonetheless etched themselves deeply on Scottish life and culture, and their influence remains powerful, if diffuse, even today. It naturally tended to stress authority, obedience and responsibility; the careful use of resources; the discipline of work; the importance of education and understanding; the intellect rather than the imagination; simplicity rather than the ornate and decorative. Its sense of the majesty of God and of human frailty and sinfulness predisposed to an attitude more douce [sic] than exuberant, more reverent, or even fearful, than

"irrational" imaginative artistic works is, to some extent, relevant to the particular regional context of Scotland in which any artistic works, like literature and art, are less valued as they may conceal the true word of the Lord.

In this social and spiritual context, to Scottish writers in the Scottish tradition imagination is not the place to explore transcendent realities (Dickson 52). On the one hand, the writers of the so-called "Kailyard" novels are apt to turn to the beauty of nature or a traditional and "idealised" myth of the country. On the other hand, when others aim depict the hard life of workers, their writings often lack imagination and have a tendency to be educational and moral vehicles (Dickson 49-50). Beth Dickson writes:

> They deal continually with the way in which such a society rejects imaginative vitality and they display the consequences of that rejection in characters whose lives are devoid of imagination or whose imaginations return to childhood as the only arena in which it is acceptable. The novels display in their plots the author's struggle to maintain an imaginative vitality which they feel to be on the verge of extinction: the imaginative characters are constantly defeated, or survive by retreating into childhood. (51)

Furthermore, imagination is treated as a "danger" in industrial Scottish novels. John Gourlay, the main character wishing to be a writer in George Douglas Brown's *The House with the Green Shutters* (1901), reaches the pessimistic conclusion that "only suicide will allow him a final escape from being overwhelmed by a riotous imagination" (qtd. in Dickson 53). The history of Scottish literature witnesses the difficulty in developing imagination, and there are dilemmas and conflicts for those writers who aim to exercise their imagination.

In *Lanark* Gray is certainly aware of this long-held problem with Scottish literature. Duncan's conflict with society because of his powering imagination is described as a marginalised "truth" in the history of Scotland. In the painting, at the opening page of Book 1, we find the slogan, "Let Glasgow flourish by telling the

---

cheerfully confident, before a God more easily associated with the stern implacability of the divine decrees than with the love of the heavenly Father" (39).

truth". The "truth" that the author aims to convey through his narrative does not correspond to a series of historical facts. It is the "truth" submerged underneath the writings of traditional Scottish authors. *Lanark* discloses the little known aspect of life in Scotland; Gray's novel takes on the challenge to oppose traditional Scottish literature by describing, at length, the life of workers and the harsh social realities in the shipyards and other heavy industries.

The account for the neglected "truth" starts with the portrayal of life in Scotland in the 1950s. This time is regarded as full of hope, as Mr Thaw, Duncan's father, believes that life after the war must be the beginning of modern history, namely the beginning of a process towards the "real civilisation" achieved through "obscure toilers" (*Lanark* 295). Mr Thaw's optimism expresses the feeling of those who endured the two world wars during which the Scottish economic situation improved greatly. Indeed, Scotland expanded its industrial economy by producing war materials, such as ships, shells, fuses and guns. At the end of the war, the coal, steel, iron and engineering industries employed almost twenty-five percent of the labour force. Unemployment was then very low in the 1940s.[3] Some individual feelings are therefore optimistic as it is demonstrated in the following historical records:

> I liked engineering. I loved the idea of these big enormous machines where you could move handles and something valuable came out. The only difference was that you'd applied your skill and intelligence and this valuable thing went into an aero-engine which helped to win the Battle of Britain.
>
> This was heaven—what a difference from the monotonous clickety-clack of the weaving shed. Here was this ship being built, a thing of beauty. There was a pride in the job they didn't have in the jute trade. I dearly loved that job. (qtd. in Devine 549)

Scotland in the 1950s was still dependent on heavy industries; besides, agriculture grew dynamically in the post-war period. Housing, which had been one of the most serious social problems in Scotland, was expanded and improved in an extensive programme of building. Mr Thaw in *Lanark* implies the generally shared belief that

---

[3] For the detailed historical account of the labour force during the 1940s, see T. M. Devine's *The Scottish Nation 1700-2000* (545-55).

social change and reformation in Scotland during the 1950s signals the arrival of a utopian era leading to a new civilisation.

In contrast, life after World War II offers little promise for the War evacuee Duncan. Witnessing the end of the war, he sums up human history as consisting of nothing but colonialism, poverty, racism and human crimes. While Mr Thaw is the earnest advocate of "the belief in the ends of history", his son interprets the end of the war "as a wound of history failed" (Craig 1991: 95). Duncan rejects his father's optimism and responses resentfully: "Worse things have happened to children every day for the last quarter million years. No kindly future will ever repair a past as vile as ours, and even if we do achieve a worldwide democratic socialist state it won't last. Nothing decent lasts. All that lasts is this mess of fighting and pain and I object to it! I object! I object!" (*Lanark* 295-6) Duncan also disagrees to his father's conviction that Scottish history is moving forwards. He asserts, on the contrary, that the country is declining from "once the world's foremost makers of several useful things" to the world in which many are killed because of "bad pay, bad housing, [and] bad feeding" (243-4). For Duncan, the hope for a new civilisation achieved by "obscure toilers" is nonsense; in his eyes, the "obscure toilers" are still victims of an unfair and inappropriate social system.

The bitter "truth" of exploited workers in the 1950s is highlighted through Gray's description of time. Following a conventional mode of depiction used by dystopian novelists, he illustrates, in Books 1 and 2, the monotonous life of workers. Duncan's shrewd sensitivity grasps the toilers' life which is totally bounded by "time":

> Hundreds of thousands of men in dirty coats and heavy boots were tramping along grey streets to the gates of forges and machine shops. He thought with awe of the energy needed to keep up a civilisation, of the implacable routines which started drawing it from the factory worker daily at eight, from the clerk and shopkeeper at nine. Why didn't everyone decide to stay in bed one morning? It would mean the end of civilisation, but in spite of two world wars the end of civilisation was still an idea, while bed was a warm immediate fact. (*Lanark* 223)

The depiction of the working class whose own identities are lost by becoming mere cogs in the industrial machine recalls Friz Lang's film *Metropolis* (1929), in which a huge clock is portrayed as the icon of human exploitation in the industrial era. The concept of time is a crucial subject in dystopian literature, since a systematised time is delineated as the effect of industrial development in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century.[4] The advent of public time means the beginning of the age in which mechanised systems are prioritised over the individual.[5] In the beginning of the twentieth century, Fredric Winslow Taylor wrote: "[In] the past the man has been first; in the future, the system must be first" (qtd. in Stevenson 2000: 126). For those who were critical of the development of the industry, the individuals were under threat because of the new industries. Thus, Karl Marx, in opposition to Taylor's optimistic view, showed his distrust of the technological world: "Through the subordination of man to the machine the situation arises in which…time is everything; man is nothing, he is at the most the incarnation of time" (ibid. 127). In dystopian novels, time becomes an objective measure ruling the life of individuals. In the realist narrative of *Lanark*, Gray highlights the established class division through the illustration of two characters with different concepts of time. On one hand, Drummond, one of Duncan's wealthy friends, is not at all concerned about time.[6] On the other hand, his friend Coulter asserts that life becomes "easy" when one functions as a "robot" in a systematised time:

> I've to go on doing this, getting up at this hour, sitting in this tram in these overalls dragging on this fag, clocking on in this queue at the gate.... You realize [sic] you'll be spending more of your life in this place than anywhere, excepting mibby bed.... But engineering isnae compulsory. I choose it. (*Lanark* 215-6)

This innocent and uneducated character is not aware that he is actually submerged in

---

[4] For a detailed historical account of a global concept of time, see Randall Stevenson's "Greenwich Meanings: Clocks and Things in Modernist and Postmodernist Fiction" (2000).
[5] Cf. E. P. Thompson's "Time and Work-Discipline" in *Customs and Common* (1991).
[6] For instance, Drummond says: "None of the clocks in this house can be relied on, least of all the ones that go" (*Lanark* 273).

the system, but believes that it is the way to be "a man" (216). Coulter's ignorance and indifference to life suggests how profoundly his soul is dominated by rational mechanisation. Yet, implications carried in Coulter's naïve words appear to be all the more serious, when we compare them with Drummond's freedom from any subordination to time.

The author's strong interest in describing the hard life of workers, which has been eschewed by previous writers in Scotland, confirms Gray's status as a postmodern writer. According to Ursula Heise's *Chronoschisms: Time, Narrative, and Postmodernism* (1997), postmodern fiction is generally divided into two groups (3). The first group of postmodern novels emphasises narrative experiments and explores new ways of representation. The second group of writers are less experimental in literary technique, but encourage writings on places and states of things which have been marginalised by mainstream historiography (Heise 3).[7] Their historical concerns are closely related to a strong interest in cultural diversity. François Lyotard asserts the principle of human difference and diversity by developing a reflection upon the failure of Western civilisation to accept the existence and difference of "the Others" in the traditional view of history. Andreas Huyssen (1994) observes:

> As an antidote to the seductive power of such fantasies, Lyotard and others have argued that recognition of the other as others, with their histories, aspirations, concrete life-worlds, is paramount. This, it seems to me, is the ethical and political core of much postmodernism, poststructuralist thought, and it has been powerfully prefigured within modernism itself, particularly in the work of Theodor Adorno. (10)

The postmodern concept of difference, in this respect, encourages a social praxis which values the complexities of personal, cultural, ethical and national identities along with their histories. Linda Hutcheon argues that postmodernism offers particular opportunities for "the contesting of centralisation of culture through the valuing of the local and peripheral" (qtd. in Stevenson 1991: 59). In *A Poetics of*

---

[7] Hans Bertens in *The Idea of the Postmodern* (1995) also writes that postmodernism gives us a chance to "focus on the local and provisional in the absence of essentialist representations" (69).

Postmodernism (1988), Hutcheon writes that postmodernism aims to "negate the space between centres and margins in ways that acknowledge difference and its challenge to any supposedly monolithic culture" (209). The postmodern sensibility of multiculturalism builds on Walter Benjamin's famous words: "There is no document of civilisation which is not at the same time a document of barbarism" (*Illuminations* 256). The idea of the German philosopher suggests that the conventional writing of history can be deemed as the act of "intellectual violence, which in the process of creating an understandable 'world', silences a critical interpretation" (Barker 119). Postmodern consciousness encourages shedding light on the hidden "truths" in the process of grand narratives of main historiography.

For contemporary Scottish writers, this postmodern notion of cultural diversity and difference is heralded as a positive driving force.[8] The growing sense of new historicity, endorsed by postmodern theorists, pervades the consciousness of Scottish writers, who live in a country "without history", in the sense that there has been "no serious need to write histories about that past" (Craig 1999: 119). Politically absorbed into British society, Scotland is a place "whose motive force driving the present from past towards future" has been totally absent (ibid. 120). Thus, postmodern sensibility awakens in the mind of today's Scottish writers the necessity of writing about the country's past. Randall Stevenson (1991) states: "Since Scotland has a longer and still more fretful history of cultural, linguistic, and desired political separateness, it would be logical to expect a postmodernist writing—especially a writing of 'difference'—to appear here as well" (59). Accordingly, the new themes are centred on the past rather than the future, insofar as the act of discovering their ignored and buried history becomes the primary purpose.

Undoubtedly, the making of *Lanark* coincides with such a growing sensitivity towards the history of "the Others" and the novel challenges the grand official records of history by telling "the truth" in the local. The manifest "Let Glasgow flourish by telling the truth" in the opening page of Gray's Book 1 demonstrates the

---

[8] In addition, Douglas Gifford and Neill McMillan (1997) argue that Scottish authors today are very conscious of postmodernity's assertion that a plurality of cultural differences expands the category of the so-called "English literature" (18).

ambition to write an alternative history of Scotland which has been so far undervalued by mainstream British history. Thus, Cairns Craig (1991) praises *Lanark* as an epoch-making work which expresses the vitality and originality of Scottish culture, a culture which was on the brink of oblivion:

> By the scale of its ambition and its apparent eccentricity, *Lanark* proclaimed the vitality and originality of a culture which, to many, seemed to be close to exhaustion, if not extinction, and was the first statement of what was to dominate Scottish writing throughout the 1980s—the effort to redefine the nature of Scottish experience and the Scottish tradition, both to account for past political failure and to begin to build a Scottish culture which would no longer be disabled by a lack of confidence in its own cultural identity. (92)

Gray's postmodernist notion of multiculturalism is illustrated in the novel by the dialogue between Duncan and McAlpin, who is Duncan's friend at the art school. McAlpin wonders why Glasgow, although a magnificent city, is never appreciated by its own inhabitants. Duncan replies that nobody has been able to picture the city through great imagination. He goes on to say:

> Then think of Florence, Paris, London, New York. Nobody visiting them for the first time is a stranger because he's already visited them in paintings, novels, history books and films. But if a city hasn't been used by an artist not even the inhabitants live there imaginatively. … Imaginatively Glasgow exists as a music-hall song and a few bad novels. That's all we've given to the world outside. It's all we've given to ourselves. (*Lanark* 243)

Duncan implies that Glasgow must be an object of imagination for the Scottish artists; otherwise, the value of the city will not take place in people's imagination.

Given that the account for this neglected "truth" constitutes *Lanark*'s main theme, we may need to consider why Gray combines the fantastic narratives of Books 3 and 4 with Books 1 and 2. The novel's strong concern of the regional gives a new perspective for the creation of utopia and dystopia. It especially brings about a new location to this literary genre. In general, utopia and dystopia is an imaginative place which reflects the author's critical approach to the existing social system. Both utopian and dystopian writers picture an imaginary, unknown place in order to highlight the difference between the world we live in and the one presented in their

texts. The discrepancy between the readers' actual world and the imaginative one provokes a critical assessment within the readers. In dystopia, the nightmarish social condition serves as a warning to prevent them from reaching the unwanted outcome. In Gray's novel, by contrast, dystopia is described nowhere but *here* in Scotland. The text suggests that writers do not necessarily imagine a bad place. For there are many places whose harsh lives have not yet been described by writers; instead of imagining of a possible horrible outcome for humankind in the future, Gray's novel conveys that there are voices and stories of the suffered or forgotten people which need to have light shed on them.

Nevertheless, Gray seems to be aware of a danger inherent in postmodern ways of thinking about historicity. The strong purpose of writing about a neglected history may pertain to a totalitarian idea as much as the historical grand narratives may emanate. The wish to present the history of marginalised people may reveal, conversely, a single committed perspective which fails to acknowledge the complexity and ambiguities of history itself. The postmodern scepticism towards universal history puts small and local history at risk of being "ahistorical" and of excluding any ambiguous and complex factors in the process of making history (Wertsch 41-2). Gray implies this problem through the illustration of the Oracle, which is summoned to show the past of Lanark at the end of Book 1. The Oracle infers the risk of being trapped in one's obsession with the past. Instead of its supposed function of telling the future, the "Oracle" is sentenced to "replaying and replaying the tedious past and past and past and past" for the sake of saving itself (*Lanark* 116). The Oracle warns Duncan against falling in the "trap", i.e. the danger of excessive self-pity and preoccupation with our own past; and the only way to eschew this is to pay respect for the past of the others (*Lanark* 116).

As the Oracle tells the protagonist that it may be saved by accounting for the history of the Others, *Lanark* as a postmodern Scottish novel deals with the issue about the possibility of focusing the provisional without having ahistorical and totalitarian tendency.[9] Gray's text suggests that Scotland can demonstrate an ideal

---

[9] See Hans Bartens's argument in *The Idea of the Postmodern* (1995).

case which both provides us with a particular social vision and a universally shared dream. In other words, the novel argues how writers today need to work on the problems of both the periphery and the centre. Literary critics in Scotland hold that Scotland can be an ideal case, because its history also belongs inside and outside that of British (or English) imperialism. Scotland is also a country comprised of fragments and differences in language and religion. The ambiguity of its location in the mainstream history of Britain and its inherent multiculturalism are what characterise the country. As Cairns Craig (1987) states in his introduction to the history of Scottish literature in the twentieth century:

> As the sweep of modernisation took in more and more of the world, and as the wars of the 20th century broke down and reconstructed the 'nations' of the world, that model of a homogeneous nation shaped within a homogeneous cultural and linguistic tradition became more and more irrelevant not only to the reality of people's experience, but to any possible projection of what nations were ever likely to be. The fragmentation and division which made Scotland seem abnormal to an earlier part of the 20th century came to the norm for much of the world's population. Bilingualism, biculturalism, and the inheritance of a diversity of fragmented traditions were to be the source of creativity rather than its inhibition in the second half of the 20th century and Scotland ceased to have to measure itself against the false 'norm', psychological as well as cultural, of the unified national tradition. (7)

In *Lanark*, Gray tries to solve the problem between the local and the universal by writing his narrative in a fantasy mode. The insertion of a fantastic story in Books 3 and 4 shows the author's aim to avoid universalising the local by dealing with peripheral stories based on fantasy. By transforming Glasgow into a strange and unrealistic place, the novel enjoys freedom of using imaginative vitality and develop the political and social problems in the particular region to more universal ones.

This attempt suggests a new approach to the creation of utopian and dystopian novels. Ruth Levitas (1991) argues that today's utopian literature has no other choice than to be fantastic after the appearance of postmodern consciousness. Since postmodernism challenges a universal idea of future, it is impossible to define utopia in space and time. Accordingly, the fantastic is the place where utopia and dystopia can free themselves for postmodern requirements.

The fantastic narrative in Gray's Books 3 and 4 plays a significant role, which shifts the particular place of dystopia to somewhere, in which the inhabitants' life is worsened. In these books, Gray applies the narrative strategy of utopian literature of the protagonist as a visitor to an unknown place, through whom the reader comes to grasp the contents of the place. Book 3 opens with the arrival of a man, Lanark (i.e. the rebirth of Duncan after his suicide), with few memories of the past, in the city called Unthank. This is a sunless city, in which people are manipulated and disheartened by the power of a global capitalist industry. Lanark then realises the terrifying fact that people have no proof of identity except by grotesque diseases; he then discovers that he also suffers from an enigmatic disease, called "dragon skin". In this dark city, people frequently disappear, although nobody seems to mind. Lanark subsequently knows that these "vaporised" people are used for the city as material resources, by being eaten and used as a part of the industrial machines. Yet, unlike the main characters of utopian novels, Lanark is not a mere visitor who is just naively overwhelmed by what he sees in the new place. In the face of the poverty and unreasonable exploitation of the innocent inhabitants, Lanark is eager to sacrifice himself to improve their living condition. Lanark is then involved in this "rational mechanisation" by accepting that he saves the life of his family in exchange for his time, namely, his "future" (437). (Gray again deals with "time" as a symbol of loss of autonomy in the face of mechanisation.) Regardless of his failure in the end, we find the protagonist struggling to construct an ideal place for the members of his society. The passion and strong motivation of the protagonist enriches the novel as a whole and his dream for a better social condition for the humankind is certainly understandable to readers across the places. In this respect, Gray's fantastic narrative offers a new perspective to utopian and dystopian literature, which may then refute the negative view of Krishan Kumar.[10] As the fantasy narrative provides the readers with an imaginary space which is beyond actual places, Gray's text suggests the possibility for utopia and dystopia of using universal themes. The universal themes as explored by Gray are centred on the personal commitment to society rather than

[10] Cf. Introduction to this thesis.

on social and political problems in the disheartening place. As such, this kind of dystopia stresses personal issues such as love, forgiveness, despair, and compassion, as is argued in the following sections of this chapter.

Gray's dystopia stresses personal issues such as love, forgiveness, despair, and compassion, which helps to locate his imaginary place beyond actual space and time. Self-reflexive nature of Gray's text suggests the possibility for utopia and dystopia of using universal themes and of achieving the value of the text beyond the geographic limit of Scotland.[1] Beat Witschi (1990) asserts that "Gray's achievement in defining a Scottish identity is that he abandons any (dogmatic) traditional concepts of Scottishness" (6).

Yet it must also be acknowledged that Gray's self-reflexive text certainly pertains to Scottish essence, which is reflected in his depicting the main protagonist in the novel. According to Colin Manlove, in his *Scottish Fantasy Literature* (1994), there is a notable difference between Scottish and English fantastic narratives; Scottish fantasy is "less" fantastic than English fantasy in the sense that Scottish fantasy is more concerned with "inwardness" and "self-reflexiveness" (14). Scottish writers set their sights on "the inward search" and try to discover something hidden within, whereas writers in English fantasy direct "the quest outwards" and search for "a known objective to be reached—the Other-end-of-Nowhere" (Manlove 11-13). Thus, English fantasy guides us to somewhere, the space of the Other, whereby it expands the framework of the readers' world view. In contrast, Scottish fantasy concentrates on the spiritual depth of characters.

The difference between Scottish and English fantasy explains the discrepancy between English and Scottish utopian and dystopian texts. Although utopian novels are mostly replaced by dystopian novels in the twentieth century, the motif of a quest is still maintained in dystopia. Kuno in E. M. Forster's "The Machine Stops" (1909) tells his mother that he has had "the most terrible journey" (24). Living in an

---

[1] Some critics discuss the self-reflexive nature of *Lanark* in terms of the text's postmodern sensibility. Randall Stevenson (1991) states that "the playful list of references and plagiarisms shows Gray highly self-conscious about using self-conscious forms of fiction: postmodernism, once largely directed by the urge to parody and subvert conventional forms of writing, becomes in its turn a recognised, accepted form to be parodied and played with itself" (55). Richard Todd (1990) in his discussion of postmodern novels writes that "[Gray and Amis] use the device of the intrusive author to exploit self-reference and self-reflexiveness in a number of interesting and noteworthy ways" (124).

underground world, Kuno visits the surface of the earth, where he sees a worm as well as anonymous creatures whom the hero ambiguously names "them" (42). Attracted by such creatures, he realises that they are "hiding in the mist and ferns until our [civilisation] stops". In his eyes, they figure as the Others which are idealised as the only hope for the future of humankind (42). As well, Huxley's *Brave New World* and Zamyatin's *We* show us new worlds. Despite the fact that it is forbidden to travel in their fictive societies, Huxley's Marx travels and encounters the Savage, and Zamyatin's D-503 come across "new unknown quantities", namely, people in the "irrational, hideous world" (*We* 32-3). In Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the place of the Other is the region of the proles; their animistic power is thought by Winston to be a driving force which will subvert the present regime.

By contrast, Scottish literature rules out the aspiration to new exterior worlds. Manlove writes that "there are no journeys in much Scots fantasy: one simply goes further within", giving as an example the words of the protagonist in George McDonald's *Lilith* (1962). The main character, Raven, desperately claims: "[The] more doors you go out of, the farther you get in!" (qtd. in Manlove 13) Understood in this way, it can be assumed that the tendency of "the inwards search" in the Scottish fantastic induces a different approach to the making of utopia and dystopia. In other words, insofar as a Scottish novel is apt to be self-reflexive, and evolves around personal matters, the location of it is more limited and personalised in Scottish utopia or dystopia.

As a work of Scottish fiction, *Lanark* clearly shares this inward-looking feature. In particular, its self-reflexive nature is paradoxically seen in Duncan's desperate desire to escape to the comfort from his situation and also in his numerous failures to opening up a new world. From the beginning of Duncan's narrative, he is unable to leap towards the outside world.[2] The novel also highlights the atmosphere of confinement; when the Thaws move to Glasgow, Duncan thinks: "the stone walls,

---

[2] For example, see *Lanark* (123): "[Thaw] went to the window and looked down into the back green. He would see friends playing there...and feel so lonely and magnified that he considered opening the window and jumping out".

stapled over with iron pipes, seemed to hold something grander and stranger than the builders knew" (227). He defines the city as "a gloomy huge labyrinth he would take years to find a way through" (46). His Senior Secondary School in Glasgow is described as "a tall gloomy red sandstone building…enclosed and [minimised] by walls with spiked railings on top" (148). As the narrative moves on, the reader realises that Duncan suffers from various problems, namely his perennial asthma, his conflict with his family, his shyness with girls, and his strong frustration due to its unachieved ambition to be a painter. They constitute obstacles preventing him from getting rid of his actual condition. As Colin Manlove (1994) aptly points out, the novel is "about acute personal discomfort", which "deserves as much attention as the cultural and political analyses which *Lanark* has so far received" (200). Certainly, political and economical issues, such as class divisions, housing problems and industrial declines, are treated as serious issues in the text; yet such issues are overshadowed by Duncan's personal problems (as well as Lanark's) derived from his living in a confined, claustrophobic location.

As Duncan cannot physically avoid Glasgow, he escapes it through his imagination and starts seeking an ideal place within his own imagination. In the school encircled by high walls, he remains absorbed in his imaginary world. Thanks to the sphere of one's consciousness, he is persuaded that he can find a perfect world in his dreams. He imagines himself as the Prime Minister of a crater, which is "protected by its walls from the envy of unhappier lands"; this imagined world is a sort of utopia in which nobody is "sick, poor or forced to live by work they hated" (158). In this utopian world, each of his personal problems is completely solved: he no longer suffers from asthma, his family does not need to worry about the lack of money, and his shyness with girls has disappeared. Duncan then embarks on materialising this perfect world through concrete forms, such as literary essays and paintings. Yet, these latter are never achieved: Duncan's artistic works are always unachieved and we find the protagonist suffering repetitious failures.

In *Lanark*, the absence of a way-out is stressed by the protagonist's recursive wish for finding a key. We see the excessive obsession of Duncan about discovering "the key":

> The key was small and precise, yet in its use *completely general and completely particular*. Once found it would solve every problem.... [The] key would make everything painful, useless and wrong become pleasant, harmonious and good. (*Lanark* 169)

Yet, Duncan's desire for this special key is always thwarted and postponed. Hoping to break through his present condition, he is, however, aware that his quest is endless. When he realises his inability to declare his love to Marjorie, let alone to other girls, he is totally disheartened and decides to go to a brothel because "the idea of prostitution [is] wholly depressing now but there [is] nowhere to retreat. Churches and home [are] places he never [wants] to visit again" (342). Yet, the idea of going to a brothel is not a good one, as he cannot enter because of his skin disease. Then, he "start[s] fingering his pockets to learn if he [has] the key" (346). Desperate to escape somewhere, he attempts to murder a girl in order to go to prison, though he later finds himself taken care of in hospital. Released from it, Duncan has no idea as to where to go. Eventually, he reaches the conclusion that the only way to get rid of this earthly world is to kill himself.

Nevertheless, Duncan's suicide brings him nowhere but the same place. In the beginning of Book 3, we find the main character on a train, feeling relieved by severing all traces of the past. The man with few memories of the past is now given the new name, Lanark, but it turns out that this new place, Unthank, is very similar to Glasgow (*Lanark* 419). He vaguely feels that this city is "pleasantly familiar" with him and also that this sunless city seems "the only city" he remembers (*Lanark* 419). We are then known that Lanark is a figure of Duncan after his death. It is not even difficult for the readers to recognise that the grotesque, fantastic description of Unthank is an exaggeration of the social deprivation existing in Glasgow. Instead of escaping into a new, unknown place, the protagonist returns to where he used to live.

Despite this, Lanark still continues to search for an escape route. Being horrified and depressed by the diseases and poor social conditions of the dystopian city, he struggles to discover a way-out. Eventually, he comes across a big mouth in the cemetery saying "I am the way out"; and he goes through it. Lanark then happens to be accommodated in a sort of medical institute, although nothing changes in this apparently new place. At worse, the "Institute" turns out to be a murdering machine, which exploits human beings for fuel and food. Disgusted, Lanark wishes to escape and demands special permission to move out from the Institute. Then, back to Unthank, Lanark and Rima (whose life has been saved by Lanark) must go through the "Intercalendrical Zone"; yet this repeatedly leads them to the door of the Institute with the same sign, "EMERGENCY EXIT 3124, NO ADMITTANCE" (378). The novel describes the "Zone" as an everlasting journey from which the protagonist has no possibility of breaking out.

These numerous attempts and failures imply that the self-reflexive novel takes its meaning in the concept of repetition. In Manlove's words, the plot of *Lanark* is a "procedure of shuttling" (200). Cairns Craig (1991) argues: "[The] force of repetition, which underlies everything in both the realistic and the fantasy sections of *Lanark*, is more powerful than the dynamics of change" (98). In this novel, repetition is illustrated by the metaphor of a window: in both the fantastic and realistic narrative, either Duncan or Lanark frequently looks through a window. Standing in front of a window, whether in Glasgow or Unthank, he is never able to see the outside view. The window of his room in the "Institute" reflects only himself, and, furthermore, presents his buried past when he used to live as Duncan (before his suicide). Watching his former life through the Oracle, Lanark understands his arrogance, haughtiness and selfishness in his former life. In this respect, the window is a self-reflective tool which amplifies the novel's inward-looking nature. It must be noted that this self-recognition becomes the driving force to encourage him to have a struggle for the well-being of the other people. Consequently, repetition is an important process through which the protagonist attains maturity. Richard Todd (1990) shows how the repetitive processes in *Lanark* contain moral issues:

> [Even] though Books 1 and 2 are impacted within them, Books three and four offer a continuation *and* a mirroring of the 'earlier' books.....More interestingly and significantly, Thaw's private, domestic, dissident and even anti-social or anti-societal concerns are replaced by Lanark's increasingly publicly-and municipally-minded ones. (126)

Gray's self-reflexive novel deals with the self-development of the individual. Through recurrent difficulties, the protagonist learns how to strengthen his patience, endurance, willingness, and indomitable spirit.

Gray's novel suggests that a place or state of utopia is not something the author exhibits in front of us. Duncan claims in his dialogue with his father, "It's an impossibility I want" (296). As his paintings of peace and harmony are never completed and his attempts to escape to the comfort are never achieved, utopia is implied through the text as something unknown and unseen. Reaching utopia might be implausible, but the novel suggests that it may be reachable through the individual's consciousness and conscience. The path to utopia is an actual impossibility; yet, hope is there and still remains. The remained hope for a better society is symbolically expressed through the protagonist's search for sunshine. In Books 3 and 4, Lanark incessantly looks for sunshine. Unthank is a dystopia with little sunshine; people suffer from air pollution caused by heavy industry and the light goes out when some suddenly disappear from the city.[3] Nevertheless the text implies that a life with sunshine is promised when the individual has a moral and decent life. Although Lanark suffers from the "dragon skin", his lodger tells him that the advancement of this disease can be stopped by "hard work for a decent cause" (43). By contrast, Ozenfant in the Institution refutes this idea with contempt: "In modern [civilisation] those who work in the sunlight are a despised and dwindling minority" (78). Thus, to crave for sunshine means to be against capitalists and industrials, whose number in the population is small but whose power is unchallenged; and Lanark searches for sun, as he believes that it will lead him to the

---

[3] Cf. "The artificially inflated land values at the centre have produced such overbuilding on the horizon that the sun is barely able to rise above it" (*Lanark* 43).

possibility of making a home, to "love, and meet friends, and work in it" (ibid.). In the end, he sits in the warm sunshine and receives "an extraordinary privilege" owing to his contribution to help humankind. The privilege is to know the date of one's death, meaning that Lanark finally finds a way out, since the Oracle tells him that "[death] is the only dependable exit" (116). Gray's dystopia has a self-reflexive nature based on the idea of spiritual maturity. In this text, repetition does not mean that the world is unchanging; rather, it suggests that, if there is a sense of hope in life, it can be attained through the development of the individual's sensibilities, such as love, forgiveness, despair, and compassion. By inferring the importance of the process towards the individual's self-development, the novel suggests the possibility of achieving better conditions anywhere.

THE "DEATH OF THE AUTHOR" AND THE POWER OF THE READER'S IMAGINATION

The text's concern with self-development is crucially related to the way of "reading". This is reflected in the particular structure and form of *Lanark*, which include experimental narrative devices.

We may start with a dialogue between the author-like figure Nastler and Lanark. While the protagonist is uplifted in Provan to discuss global issues in a general assembly of council delegates, he is advised to meet a man called Nastler, who is supposed to know "everything about everything" (*Lanark* 478). It turns out that the mysterious man was once called "King", although he nowadays deemed as "not at all grand" (*Ibid.*). People can see him anytime they like and exchange opinions with him. Lanark is told that he is "the author" of the protagonist (481). Yet, the discussion between Lanark and Nastler shows how this self-asserting "author" is unreliable, since Nastler is naively dismayed when Lanark asserts that he has seen "God" (481); furthermore, he has no idea about the conclusion of his story, and instead asks Lanark to explain how the novel ends.[1]

This dialogue conveys Gray's idea about authorship. It presents a criticism of the traditional role of the author defined as the unique source of creation. This is similar to contemporary theoretical discussions of authorship as developed by Roland Barthes, Julia Kristeva, and Michel Foucault, which propound the "death of the author". Kristeva (1980) develops Bakhtin's idea that a text is a mosaic of quotations and is thus the absorption and transformation of another text. She speaks of "a permutation of texts, an intertextuality: in the space of a given text, several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and [neutralise] one another" (36). The critical stance about the "death of the author" questions whether an author's intention can be the basis of interpreting the meaning of the text. In his essay, "Death of the Author" (1958), Barthes states that "the text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture" (146); a text itself exists as "the text-between of

---

[1] Cf. Dominique Costa's argument: "This interview topos in which McHale remarks in his *Postmodern Fiction*. The level of the fictional world and the ontological level occupied by the author as maker of the fictional world collapse together, producing what he calls 'a short-circuit of the ontological structure' constitutes 'a topos of postmodernist writing'" (213). See also Richard Todd's argument (1990).

another text" and embraces numerous "sources" and the "influence" from other texts. Thus, a text is like a textile interwoven by "anonymous" and "untraceable" citations (Barthes 1977: 155-64). He adds:

> Any text is a new tissue of past citations. Bits of code, formulate, rhythmic models, fragments of social languages, etc. pass into the text and are redistributed within it, for there is always language before and around the text. Intertextuality, the condition of any text whatsoever, cannot, of course, be reduced to a problem of sources or influences; the intertext is a general field of anonymous formulate whose origin can scarcely ever be located; of unconscious or automatic quotations, given without quotation-marks. (1981: 39)

Barthes argues that the concept of "the author" is an ideological construct which tells us that a text is univocal insofar as it originates from a singular, unified source. He refutes the established view and shows that the meanings of a text derive from numerous voices and discourses; in other words, a text is plural, equivocal, and indeterminate. Thus, to resort to an original and unified source is meaningless, meaning that the process of reading is an activity that aims to confront various meanings from diverse origins. Accordingly, textual meaning is not given by the author but discovered by the reader. Barthes holds that the reader is "the space on which all the quotations that make up a writing are inscribed without any of them being lost; a text's unity lies not in its origin but in its destination" (148). As the text's meanings are based upon readings, they become indeterminate and contingent. The author is not qualified to convey a fixed meaning, since meanings are produced by readers themselves.[2]

In Gray's novel, the elaborated literary devices from the Epilogue clearly suggest that the author is no longer the only source for literary imagination. Gray exhibits an "Index of plagiarisms" which displays previous authors and texts which are supposed to have had a certain influence upon the creation of *Lanark*. As well, the list of footnotes in a section of the Epilogue shows that the author's imagination is not the only cause in the production of the novel. The novel overtly addresses the fact that the author's creation of the novel would not be possible without the power

---

[2] Cf. Terry Eagleton's *Literary Theory* (1983: 119).

of anonymous people. Thus a footnote acknowledges those who offered help and support in the completion of the work: "Mrs Florence Allan typed and retyped his manuscripts, and often waited many months.... Yet these are only a few out of thousands whose help has not been acknowledged and whose names have not been mentioned" (*Lanark* 499).[3]

Gray's celebration of ordinary people can be interpreted within the context of Scottish literature which has a "long tradition of a literate working-class" (Craig 1999: 34). Many Scottish writers are from a lower-class background and use this background, and take their experiences as the basis of their work (Craig 1991: 90-1). The term "working-class" in a Scottish context is different from the English "working-class", insofar as the Scottish context defines "working-class" as part of a "folk" culture. It is a culture of people who work for their week-to-week survival. Manfred Malzahn in "Industrial Novel" (1987) states:

> This is also true of Scottish self-perception, in which working-class features are important because they are more identifiably Scottish than their more anglicised urban middle-class counterparts. Consequently, the assertion of a working-class identity in a Scottish context is likely to appear also as the assertion of a Scottish identity, in spite of the cosmopolitan aspect of industrial culture, which favours a kind of basic global uniformity. (230)

Such a context encourages the production of novels celebrating the life of common people. So, for instance, while Marx in Huxley's *Brave New World* respects the fence between the working-class and the intelligentsia, and Winston Smith in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* admires the Proles from a distance, Gray's Lanark claims: "I know them. I grew up among them. You middle-class liberals like to pet them, but I wouldn't let them breed..." (*Lanark* 438). Christopher Harvie (1991) attributes Gray's success to his "literary articulateness of the West of Scotland working class" and his challenge of former Scottish writers who avoided facing the life of devalued people in favour of the mythical values of rural Scottish life (78). Gray's novel, in this respect, shows that his artistic work results from an

---

[3] On this point, see also Cairns Craig's criticism (1991: 90).

accumulation of the powers of these "folk" people, whom Duncan's father calls "obscure toilers" (*Lanark* 295).[4]

This view undermines the "basis for the privileged claims of high culture to be the criterion of aesthetic supremacy" (Stauth and Turner 509). Gray's celebration of folk culture has an affinity with a postmodern idea, but also corresponds to the Scottish tradition that culture and society, in which no authorised figure can exercise its power in totalising and unifying fragments. For the totality of Scottish culture is indeterminate in the sense that for "the 'real' Scot, the 'true identity' was entirely unstable: it was an instability which...gave rise to the conception of the Scot, as in some sense, schizophrenic, self-divided" (Craig 1987: 7). In other words, Scotland embraces "otherness" within itself: the linguistic divides (with the Gaelic, Scots and English languages) exist in Highland and Lowland, along with Calvinism and Catholicism which constitute the "divided self" of Scotland. Such diversities show that subjectivity cannot be regarded as singular, as noted by John Macmurray's *Persons in Relation* (1961):

> The "You and I" relations...constitutes the personal, and both the "You" and "I" are constituted, as individual person, by the mutuality of their relation. Consequently, the development of the individual is not the development of his relation to the Other.... We all distinguish ourselves...from the society of which we are members and to which we belong.... We are part of that from which we distinguish ourselves, and to which, as agents, we oppose ourselves. (qtd. in Craig 1999: 112)

Scotland values multiculturalism and human diversity. Cairns Craig holds that the "divided-self" is not necessarily contrasted with "undivided-self"; rather, this fragmented self is a mirror of the "self-in-relation" (1999: 114). A nation which

---

[4] This is also implied by Gray's depiction of workers' life in *Lanark*. Thus, "sunshine", which symbolises the place of decent life, can be found in the home of Lanark's friend who belongs to the working class:

> Sunlight streamed in through the windows and the car seemed to be thrusting slowly forward through a shrubbery of rosebushes... He [Lanark] saw golden-brown bees working in the hearts of the roses and heard their drowsy humming, the rustle of leaves, some distant bird calls. (446)

In addition, Harvie (1991) writes: "Ordinary life, for instance, is something which requires decency and courage. This seems to be a conviction common to the Glasgow writers" (83).

entails the "self-in-relation" finds itself being "between cultures rather than within a culture" (Witschi 1989: 207). A subjective sensibility which embraces otherness is symbolically illustrated in *Lanark*'s scene of the "Intercalendrical Zone". Rima and Lanark realise that the road on which they are walking "slopes downhill on this side of the line and uphill on the other" (*Lanark* 377). The description of the road recalls M.C. Escher's paintings, especially his "Ascending and Descending" (1960), whose main motif depicts some stairs. In this painting, the inhabitants of a building, who seem to be monks, are forced to climb stairs for a few hours everyday. Yet, the painter explains, that "when they get tired they are allowed to turn about and go downstairs instead of up. Yet both directions, though without meaning, are equally useless" (*The Graphic Work of M.C. Escher* 16). The painter describes two directions, because of distinct "contrasts":

> Life is possible only if the senses can perceive contrasts.... Isn't it fascinating to [realise] that no image, no form, not even a shade or [colour] 'exist' on its own; that among everything that's visually observable we can refer only to relationships and to contrast? (qtd. in Schattschneider 99)

One's existence might be meaningless without the existence of the Other. No one exists "on its own". Indeed, we see that it is the reconciliation of Lanark and Rima that helps them to weather the crisis in the "Intercalendrical Zone".

As well, Gray's text suggests that the meaning and fecundity of the novel is amplified by the readers' potential power. Nastler emphasises the existence of a reader: "I am like God the Father, you see, and you are my sacrificial Son, and a reader is a Holy Ghost who keeps everything joined together and moving along" (*Lanark* 495). Isobel Murray and Bob Tait (1984) argue that this triangular relationship between Father, Son, and Holy Ghost is a prerequisite for literary creation: "The 'author' as God the Father, Lanark as the sacrificial Son, and the reader as a Holy Ghost whose attentive spirit is required in order to keep the whole show together" (233). Also Nastler explains the importance of the reader to Lanark in terms of the "physics" of the world surrounding the literary characters. He claims that Lanark's existence and autonomy has little ontological meanings in the cosmos

called the "book"; in other words, Lanark's world is "lifeless" since composed of mere printed words.[5] Their life is induced only by the reader, as Nastler says: "Your survival as a character and mine as an author depend on us seducing a living soul into our printed world and trapping it here long enough for us to steal the imaginative energy which gives us life" (*Lanark* 485). Lanark's "lifeless" world is animated only through the reader' act of "reading" (484-5).

It is implied, furthermore, that the creation of the text is an everlasting process, since the novel always meets new readers. John Frow, among others, argues that intertextuality creates new complexities whenever a text meets a new reader; the new reader's approach to the text may "involve a different set of intertextual relations". He argues that "any particular construction of a set of intertextual relations is limited and relative—not to a reading subject but to the interpretive grid (the regime of reading) through which both the subject position and the textual relations are constituted" (1986: 155). According to Frow, intertextuality is associated with the reader's varied expectations. Therefore, the reader has an active role to play, and thereby they can control and change the meanings of the novel (183-4).

The text's concept of the "death of the author" is crucially related to the insertion of the Epilogue in the middle of Book 4. Nastler says that the Epilogue is "too important" and "essential" to be at the end of the novel (483). As has been discussed in the previous section, *Lanark* centres on the protagonist's spiritual development, and the Epilogue highlights some contrary opinions of the role of the author. Whereas Nastler believes in the "death of the author", as the former painter, Lanark (i.e. Duncan) is still certain that his existence is in its own and also that he possesses the creator's power. Thus, Lanark refuses the idea that his life is "useless" without the presence of the reader; yet, Naster criticises his haughtiness: "Frankly, Lanark, you are too stolid and commonplace to be entertaining as a successful man" (*Lanark* 485). Nastler considers that the best thing he can do is "to write a story in

---

[5] In *Lanark*, the protagonist says: "Listen.... I never wanted anything but some sunlight, some love, some very ordinary happiness...and now I'm nearly an old man and my reasons for living have shrunk to standing up in public and saying a good word for the only people I know. And you tell me that world will be useless! That you have *planed* it to be useless" (484).

which adjective like *commonplace* and *ordinary* have the significance", in the sense that he values the reader's interpretation more than his own creative ability. Lanark is, on the contrary, confident with his own capacity to produce meaning by himself. In Books 1 and 2, Duncan is obsessed with his own talent and thinks of his work as "more important than anything else" (*Lanark* 237). He enthusiastically believes in his power to represent, in his paintings, a world of harmony, though his ambition is never achieved. Likewise, Books 3 and 4 show Lanark's willingness to create a world of humanity.[6] Then the Epilogue challenges Lanark's grand ambition and defends Nastler's scepticism. After the Epilogue, the novel describes Lanark's failure in his mission, after his nomination as the Lord Provost of Greater Unthank. His failure echoes the death of authorship, i.e. the limitation of creative power, and means to decentre the position of a unifying and totalising power.

As we have seen earlier, *Lanark* places an emphasis on the life of ordinary people. At the end of the novel, Lanark becomes a "common" man; the protagonist is even known that his name is now "common" in Unthank (*Lanark* 554). He realises that he is no longer the "Lord Provost of Greater Unthank", but just an ordinary, ageing man. Yet, he still asks Rima: "But how will my son—how will the *world* manage when I'm not here?" (559) Rima finds his question meaningless and tells him that the world is "only improved by people who do ordinary jobs and refuse to be bullied" (554). Edwin Morgan (1991) praises this ending:

> It is a wonderful conclusion which returns us, after the hero's different lives and adventures in time and space, after all the complexities of the narrative, to an ordinary old man with an ordinary mixture of feelings, anxious and content at the same time, sitting looking at the sky from a very ancient part of Glasgow. (75)

Isobel Murray and Bob Tait (1984) hold that "how exactly one 'reads' this will depend in part on how the ending is interpreted and in particular on the view one

---

[6] For instance, Craig (1991) states: "Thaw and Lanark divide between them the possibilities of trying to transform life by art and politics—another dualism of the modern condition sundering the aesthetic from the practical—only to discover that they live in a nightmare world" (94).

takes of Lanark's feelings and outlook at that point" (223). The final scene must certainly be viewed as positive, since Lanark is finally able to enjoy the sun, is given "the privilege" of knowing his coming future (i.e. his death), and feels grateful for his reconciliation with Rima and his son. Knowing one's death means here that the protagonist finally finds a way-out, as the Oracle tells Lanark that death is "the only dependable exit" (116). Therefore, the ending expresses an optimistic belief in humankind.

In the whole novel, both protagonists (Duncan and Lanark) search for a way to find utopia, i.e. a perfect place for human reconciliation and harmony far from the oppression of any social order. Their hope is never achieved, as Duncan's paintings are never completed and Lanark's ambition remains an impossible dream. Nevertheless, the novel does not deny the utopian spirit. Utopia is not judged as irrelevant. There is a utopian hope; thus can be understood in relation to the argument of Herbert Marcuse in *One Dimensional Man* (1964) that the subordinate groups are to turn over the dominant values of the ruling class in capitalistic society in which mass production and mass consumption are important factors. More importantly, like Ernst Bloch, who discovers the source of utopia in mass culture, Marcuse shows a forward-looking view of art "as the bearer of utopia"; he considers art as "offering only a glimpse of a utopia which is unattainable" (qtd. in Levitas 262). In *The Aesthetic Dimension* (1979) he states as well: "Art cannot change the world, but it can contribute to changing the consciousness and drives of men and women who could change the world" (ibid.). Gray's view of utopia is somehow similar to Bloch's and Marcuse's, meaning that "a glimpse of a utopia which is unattainable" is present in *Lanark*. The novel also implies that each individual utopian image is by no means convincing to others in the same way as Duncan's painting is barely appreciated. Accordingly, creating a grand narrative and universal vision is hardly plausible; yet, utopian hope remains present within each individual.

Such a hope suggests that it is the reader' imagination that unifies the novel's fragmentation, rupture, incongruity, and diversity. The idea that the text can be enlivened by anonymous readers is relevant to the apparently illogical order of this

novel. The novel's structure that starts with Book 3, followed by Books 1, 2, and 4 reflects the author's concept of time; time does not matter, since language allows any temporal distortion in the limited framework of the cosmos (*Lanark* 481). Ageing is incredibly fast in the world of Unthank with a calendar based on a twenty-five-hour day; as well, in the "Intercalendrical Zone", past, present and future are not juxtaposed but overlap simultaneously. As its subtitle ("A Life in 4 Books") clearly shows, the novel describes a man's life from childhood to old age within almost 550 pages. Such playful descriptions of time demonstrate the author's ability to free himself from any temporal constraints derived from a standard definition of time. The anxiety about time is a theme derived from the writers of Modernism. Human aspiration to be free from time is expressed through their narrative techniques such as monologue, stream of consciousness and flashback. These literary methods represent a wish to be free from a systematising and totalising concept. The principle that the dignity of the individual has priority over the globally standardised, impersonal social condition is brought to the fore by their inventive strategies. Yet, drawing on Modernist writers' techniques as such, postmodern writers like Gray shows a crucial difference in their notion of totality. Ursula Heise (1997) writes:

> Furthermore, the comparison of different narrators' accounts in a modernist novel usually allows one to form a fairly consistent picture of the events that lie behind them. No such motivation, however, is normally given for postmodernist repetitions. As a consequence, it is also impossible for the reader to infer a coherent image of the actions that underlie the repetitions, since there is no criterion for evaluating the reality of any version the text happens to present. (56)

As the meanings of Lanark's life depend on the reader's understanding and imagination, the illogical order of the novel infers the importance of their capability. Nastler in the Epilogue states that he has no idea about the ending of the novel. The Epilogue does not play its supposed role as far as it is placed in the middle of the novel without any assuring signs of the end. Likewise, there is no secured position for conclusion. This implies the impossibility and unattainability of completing the work. Randall Stevenson in his "Alasdair Gray and the Postmodern" (1991)

observes: "The real achievement of *Lanark* is not in seducing readers with illusion, but in allowing them to escape from it; in forcing them to consider conjuring and to examine and experience imagination as *process* rather than security finished product..." (61 emphasis added). Each reader's act of reading is celebrated as an important process towards making of the novel. The novel is offered as a place for the readers, where they discover and cultivate their own initiative. That the author deliberately inserts the Epilogue in the middle of the book suggests that his book is still under the process of construction. Isobel Murray and Bob Tait (1984) argue that Gray's text indicates that "our end is our beginning" (238). The novel represents itself as an everlasting process. It is assumed that such features as fragmentation, rupture and diversity of the novel can be unified only through the readers' comprehension and imaginative ability. This is most clearly reflected in the Epilogue. As mentioned above, it is comprised of several elements such as the main narrative, captions, detailed notes and the "Index of Plagiarisms". Such fragmented factors imply that the readers can arrange and choose their way of reading; some may start reading footnotes, and others may firstly read the main narrative. Their process of reading is arbitrary, and, accordingly, readers are also expected to discover their own pace in their process of reading. It must be acknowledged that Duncan believes that human civilisation is built upon the individual's "memory and conscience" (*Lanark* 296). As well, it is the reader's memory and imaginative speculations that construct and unify the world of *Lanark*. Therefore, if the grand utopian vision in the traditional sense is now considered as an impossibility, there is still a utopian dream located in our conscience, memory and imagination.

Chapter IV
Abe Kobo's Inter Ice Age 4
Reflection upon Everyday Life as a Critical Measure against Totalisation

The most important Japanese utopian novel written after the Second World War is *Inter Ice Age 4* (1958) by Abe Kobo (1924-93). The novel is located in Tokyo in the near future, in Japan's post-industrial era. During the country's double-digit economic growth in the 1960s, Japan experienced what François Lyotard in *The Postmodern Condition* (1979) describes as the coming transformation of knowledge (4). In this book the French theoretician argues that the rise of new technology (such as technological communications, information storage, data banks, etc.) will have a great impact on human knowledge, and leads to an era in which the storage of knowledge becomes the key to control the life of each individual.

Abe's *Inter Ice Age 4* reflects this new social context through the protagonist's dedication to computer technology. The novel starts with a scientist, called Katsumi, who has the project of foreseeing the future by means of a computer. However, he is forced to give up his current research, because the government becomes aware that the computer machine is capable of conjecturing political and economical decisions that may affect the stability of the world. Susequently, Katsumi shifts the object of his research to more "personal" and "ordinary" cases. He then studies the case of an apparently "normal" man in order to predict his future; yet, the man is murdered the day after. Katsumi realises that he is involved in this enigmatic murder. Meanwhile, some strange incidents happen: his pregnant wife is taken to a strange place (in the guise of hospital) where she is forced to undertake an abortion, and he frequently receives mysterious phone calls from someone that he does not recognise even though he has the feeling he knows him. As the story moves on, we find that his wife's abortion and the man's murder are connected. Katsumi eventually knows that his wife was taken to the institute that undertakes the scientific project of transforming embryos into semi-human creatures living in the sea, called the aquans. It turns out then that the man, the object of Katsumi's research, was murdered

because he knew about this confidential project of the aquans from his mistress, who gave her embryo to this institute in exchange for money. By using the narrative form of a detective fiction, Abe demonstrates how everyday life of the individual is involved in the social and political organisation.

This chapter will start by describing Abe's challenge against the utopian writers of previous generations. Through his sense of the nomad, he develops a sceptical view of any social protocols and established habits. The second section will study Abe's deconstructive approach of the everyday, which is related to the making of his own utopian novel. Finally, the third section of this chapter will show how, in his text, everyday life should be harnessed to the idea of uncertainty, arguing that this leads to a criticism of a sense of continuity and totality. Thus, in Abe's novel, the future cannot be immanent in the present, in the sense that the possible futures cannot be determinate or depicted through the mere repetitions of the present.

THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE "NOMAD" AUTHOR

Reading of Abe's literary work requires some postulates of which we have to be aware. Abe is radically anti-traditionalist: his special interest in European avant-garde techniques causes the general impression in Japan that he is, still, very difficult to evaluate in terms of Japanese literary history.[1] Yet, Abe is one of a few post-war Japanese novelists, who has gained an extraordinarily wide readership outside his country (such as in Eastern Europe). This does not mean that Abe intended to attract a foreign audience. His texts were, rather, created out of what he witnessed in post-war Japanese society. In other words, Abe acquired the international fame on account of his striking ability to translate and develop everyday realities and their issues into an international level. As the novelist Oe Kenzaburo describes in his lecture in New York (1993): "Abe's basic approach toward writing was to portray not the people of

---

[1] One of the most important factors in Abe's artistic development was his joining of the *avant-garde* movement initiated by Hanada Kiyoteru, the editor of *Shin Nippon Bungaku* (*New Japanese Literature*), in the 1940s. His interests in Heidegger's philosophy and in the Modernism's literary techniques, in particular the Surrealistic method of writing, were consolidated during this time.

present-day Japan, but human beings in their most universal condition—the Universal Man, so to speak" (323). The "universal" in Abe's texts can best be perceived through his insight into "everyday life", which is treated as a vital subject when contemplating the future of humankind.

The importance of Abe's *Inter Ice Age 4* lies in its refutation of the conventional Japanese utopian literature, which has mainly followed the styles and themes of Western utopian novels since the end of the nineteenth century.[2] Around this time Japanese society faced two drastic changes in its political and social structure; namely, the overthrow of the Tokugawa Shogunate (1600-1868) and the reopening of Japan's contacts with the West. The fall of the Tokugawa government was initially assumed to be the end of rigid social structures under which people's customs, work practices, and caste privilege were strictly regulated. Nevertheless, the historical shift of the Meiji period (1868-1912) did not mark the emergence of an entirely new social model. The new regime attempted to manipulate selected features of Tokugawa society to impose social and moral structure which was then taken to be "traditional". This sense of the necessity of maintaining social unity and hierarchical structure was born out of the country's diplomatic issues. After having spent more than 150 years in isolation, Japan now had to commence diplomatic relations with Western countries and, subsequently, realised their vulnerability to the threats of Western forces. Accordingly, an ambition to achieve an equal status with the Western countries emerged among the Japanese. The term "westernisation" was interpreted as "modernisation", which was extolled as a popular aspiration, and wide-ranging social reforms and many attempts at adopting Western principles and ideas were undertaken at this time.[3]

Writings from the West were welcomed as intellectual tools to construct a new and "ideal" modern society.[4] For the first time, the Japanese learns about the

---

[2] A detailed historical account of Japanese utopian literature is given in my essay, "Japanese Utopian Literature from the 1870s to the Present and the Influence of Western Utopianism" published in *Utopian Studies: Journal of the Society for Utopian Studies* 10.2 (1999).
[3] See Marius Jansen's *The Making of Modern Japan*. (2002: 484).
[4] H. Gene Blocker and Christopher Starling (2001), among others, refer to Japan's reception of Western ideas; they particularly describe the influence of Hegel and the concept of totality on the Japanese intellectuals around this time (125, 133-4).

particular socio-political concept called "utopia". According to Alfred Aldridge (1985), twenty-three utopian texts from Europe are translated and published in Japan in the last decade of the nineteenth century (184). The first translation of Thomas More's *Utopia* is released in 1882 entitled *On an Ideal Nation*, and is republished in 1904 with the new title, *On the Construction of a New Nation*.[5] The translated titles of More's work imply that this major utopian text is regarded as a guide on how to construct a modern world based on European thoughts; it is used to enlighten the political consciousness of the Japanese people. Inspired by writings from the West, Japanese intellectuals and writers also attempt to create their own utopian novels.[6] Their writings are characterised by a strong sense of authorship, the belief that the author needs to guide readers towards the achievement of a new nation. Unlike the Western utopian writers, Japanese writers during the Meiji period seem to be less interested in investigating their own society with a critical consciousness; they are more apt to endorse the political ideology of the State.[7]

However, the Japanese society of the twentieth century witnesses a change in utopian narrative, especially when Japan heads for militarism and imperialism. After the First World, Japan experiences an export-led economic growth and becomes a creditor nation for the first time, although for a short period. Industrial output quintuples and overtakes agriculture in 1919. However, Japan's economic expansion ends with the end of the war and, as a result, unemployment increases (Tsuzuki 224). After the great Kanto earthquakes in 1923, the human and material costs escalate economic depression. In the social turmoil of the financial panic of the 1920s, some writers start opposing the State's policies and investigate the social conditions. Now utopian writers attack the social structure for its unfair treatments against the poor and the discriminated. With the considerable influence of Western Marxism, these writers, who are generally dubbed as the group of "proletarian" ("*puroretaria*") writers, mainly start exploring an ideal place for the working-class living in poverty

---

[5] Cf. Shunichi Takayanagi (1983) and Kawabada Kaori (1971).
[6] For instance, Tsubouchi Shoyo (1884), Suehiro Tetcho (1884), Nakae Chomin (1888) and Koda Rohan (1900-1) create utopian texts during this time.
[7] On this point, see also Napier's study on Japanese literature (1996).

and misery. By referring to the "scientific" and "rational" analysis of Marxism, they aim to unveil the injustice of class exploitation in the name of ethical concerns. They defend "the Marxist 'story' of liberation of humanity from oppression and ignorance *via* the class struggle" (Mclennan 348), and they work on creating a new style of utopian literature in order to fight against the wrongs of capitalism, aiming to help the working class free itself. [8] Yet, their anti-regime attitude becomes the object of the State's control and surveillance and, as a result, some of them were arrested and punished to death.

Despite their social criticisms, proletarian writers fail to build up a basis of mass support.[9] Among possible answers, Maruyama Masao in his *Thought in Japan* (*Nihon no Shiso*) (1961) favours the view that the decline of proletarian literature is caused by the writers' dependence on a Marxist concept of "totality". Maruyama, the Japan's most celebrated intellectual, investigates the influence of German philosophy on Japanese society.[10] He pays particular attention to the "excessive rationalism" which the proletarian writers draw from their critical methods in social science (82-4). Maruyama identifies this "excessive rationalism" with "totalised scientism", and questions the degree of legitimacy concerning Marxist scientific and objective analyses. He refutes the view that truth can be induced from a logical analysis, insofar as this conception neglects the irrational aspects of reality (89). In an similar way to that of the German philosopher Jürgen Habermas, he stresses the importance of interpreting irrationality in politics, for to understand the irrational aspects of politics is essential to the study of politics.[11] He explains the decline of the Japanese

---

[8] Theoretically, Marxism pertains to the class analysis of modern capitalist societies. Marxists consider that capitalism exists and thrives on the basis of the exploitation of labour by capital. The dynamics of technological development can be explained in terms of the labour-capital relation and the incessant drive for profits. This economic structure determines the social priorities, political formations and ideological conditions of a capitalist society. Traditional Marxism defines class analysis as "objective", stressing that the ultimate rationale for our thought and behaviour is constructed through the logic of the mode of production and the social relations which characterise that mode. Marxist analysis in this sense aims to be "scientific" and is committed to the project of "rationally" revealing the various ideological distortions which mask the real driving forces in modern society.

[9] See Janet Hunter's *The Emergence of Modern Japan* (1989: 251-264).

[10] Cf. Blocker (133-4).

[11] Cf. Habermas's "Die Moderne—ein unvollendetes Projekt" (1981) and "Bemerkungen zu einer verworrenen Diskussion—Was bedeutet 'Aufarbeitung der Vergangenheit' heute?" (1992).

proletarian literature owing to the writers' preference for "totalised" political discourses, which produce monolithic works and neglect the irrational sides of everyday life.

In this respect, Abe's literary project marks a significant departure from the proletarian utopian novels, since he aims to decentre any unifying and totalising powers and forms. Besides, unlike the writers of the Meiji period, Abe does not endorse any political ideologies of the State.[12] He rather explores literary subjects through his deconstructive approach. He intends to do so by introducing his particular point of view of the "nomad" author, which is formed through his personal experiences. His nomad sensibility means that the author always finds himself rootless, or being in the margins of society. Born in 1924, Abe soon moved to Manchuria in China because of his father's work, and stayed there until the age of sixteen (until 1940). As a result of Japanese imperialism and its aggression against China, a lot of Japanese people had to return to Japan; yet, Abe voluntarily went back to China and stays there until the end of the war.

Abe's move to China during the war-time is crucial to understand his literary production. It frames his nomad sense, his deconstructive concept of totality, and his particular notion of collectivity. Living in China in that particular moment and witnessing the process of dissolution of the Chinese nation, he becomes doubtful of the *raison d'être* of a governed nation. In an essay (1992), Abe writes that he has seen "the complete destruction" of social order in China, which makes him realise that the nation is by no means an absolute existence (246). After his stay in China, he always aims to investigate any situation in which humans blindly trust society, leading themselves to lose their own subjectivity and identity (1993: 71). It must also be acknowledged that Abe has no experience of the upsurge of nationalism in Japan during the 1930s (since he was in China). His lack of direct contact with Japan helps

---

[12] Kurihara (1983) argues that Abe's work is a model of "a new political novel" in Japanese literature after the Second World War, i.e. a new literary mode which refuses to endorse the state's political ideology (52).

him to assess the Japanese society with a critical distance.[13] Also, the author states several times that he is always uncertain about his "home", wondering where he finds himself feeling most at ease.

However, Abe's sense of rootlessness does not lead to arguments in favour of anarchism or abrogation of citizenship. His criticism against total social orders is not connected with a revolt against established authorities. Instead, the author denounces one's passive attitude towards everyday life that easily relies on the existence of the community or the state as something natural. It is this sensibility, Abe argues, that results in accepting the power from the above. His argument starts with the presupposition that there is an unavoidable fact in our life that we live in a nation as a citizen; then the question to be challenged is how each person sees through the mechanism of the nation from within. He stresses the danger of considering the nation as granted "naturally" and "universally" ("*Zoku uchinaru henkyo*" 1969: 326-7). He appeals to the necessity of deconstructing this "universally" approved normality and denies an absolute existence to the State.

Abe's strong interest in the perception of something habitual and common in everyday life is resonant with a similar concern expressed by Modernism in the West. Theoretical concerns with everyday life emerge as a distinctively modern phenomenon at the end of the nineteenth century; it becomes an object of reflection and representation in literature and art. According to Ben Highmore in *The Everyday Life Reader* (2002), the everyday is generally analysed from two contrary points of view: one is defined as a 'micro tendency' that works on everyday life as the realm of the repetitions and habits, and the other is a 'macro analysis' which is concerned with the ordering governance of daily life. As Highmore puts it:

> So, in approaches that have privileged the particular we can find tendencies that have stressed other features of everyday life: the agency of individuals in daily life, forms of resistance or non-conformity to social structures, a stress on feelings and experience. Similarly, to approach everyday life as a realm of generality tends to privilege social structures, institutions and discourses, and to see these as a domain of power determining the everyday. (5)

---

[13] On Japanese nationalism and its excessive belief in ethnic superiority, see Donald Keene's *The Japanese Discovery of Europe, 1720-1830* (1969).

How to approach the dualistic division of everyday life is one of the main issues of Modernism. They particularly consider the everyday in favour of the micro tendency, referring to what Charles Baudelaire terms "the ephemeral, the fugitive, the contingent" of modern life (qtd. in Highmore 297). For instance, Georg Simmel, in his review of the Berlin Trade Exhibition (1896), praises a sensitive empirical attention to everyday material world. As he writes: "Nowhere else is such a richness of different impressions brought together so that overall there seems to be an outward unity, whereas underneath a vigorous interaction produces mutual contrasts, intensification and lack of relatedness" (299). Simmel argues that the social impetus of modernity signifies a "gnawing pressure of heterogeneous impressions, and the ever faster and more colourful change of excitements" (298). Subsequently, the possibility of new styles of art and literature are imagined along with Surrealistic approaches to society and culture. The aim is to comprehend vividly what everyday life is, independently of inert philosophical abstractions. Likewise, Modernist writers' literary techniques, such as stream of consciousness, montage, defamiliarisation, are primary methods to represent everyday life. Thinking of everyday life through this cultural mood defines the everyday as a critical measure against totalisation and rationalisation. Therefore, as one of the most well-known *avant-garde* writers in Japan, Abe applies the techniques of Surrealism and defamiliarisation to his work.

A key subject in the arts of Modernism is the concept of "home". To be attached to home is regarded as a regressive desire. The theoreticians and writers of Modernism impugn the thought that home is "a specific [materialisation] of the body and the self" and denies the possibility that "things and spaces become layered with meaning; value and memory" (qtd. in Felski 25). By contrast, Modernist writers celebrate boundary crossing, which implies the criticism of dwelling, as it means to be content with established notions and customs. Theodor Adorno writes thus: "Dwelling, in the proper sense, is now impossible.... It is part of morality not to be at home in one's home" (ibid. 23). The conventional idea that "home" is "a symbolic

extension and confirmation of the self" has little meaning. Thus, to be constantly on the move is valued, as it is expressed by "the city streets, the site of random, encounters, unexpected events, multiplicity and difference" (ibid. 22).

Modernists' approach to everyday life and the concept of "home" is in direct conflict with traditional utopian writers, for whom "home" is a place to celebrate. Searching for the image of *Heimat* (home/land) often constitutes the core of traditional utopian novels. As Tom Moylan (1986) writes, "the romance or the fantastic, including Utopia, focuses on a quest for what has been repressed or denied, for *Heimat*...that sense of home which includes happiness and fulfilment", utopian novels frequently carries weight, especially when they show nostalgia or a strong desire for a home (34). Moreover, utopian literature often stresses the concept of family, as it symbolises a minute version of the nation. Such a vision of "home", as pictured by utopian writers, is related to the everyday life representing solidity, stability and fulfilment; namely, something similar to "the former home of all human beings", as called by Sigmund Freud (qtd. in Felski 23). As well, dystopian novels define a wish for "home"; protagonists search for "home" as a place of spiritual satisfaction. Winston in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* wishes that the little room above Mr Charrington's shop will be protected as an eternal "hiding-place that [is] truly their own", in which he will be able to enjoy what is regarded as a normal family life in the old sense (*1984* 145). Alex in *A Clockwork Orange* tells us: "Home home, home, it was home I was wanting" (119). Gray's *Lanark* portrays a man who sacrifices his life and passion in order to provide his family with a stable, peaceful dwelling. Although dystopia as a negative mirror of utopia shows the difficulty of the aspiration for "home", the value of *Heimat* is still present in these dystopian novels.

To understand the concept of "home" in Abe's work, we also need to take into consideration the notion of collectivity in Japanese society. "Home" ("*Ie*") in Japan has contained political implications; it has been deemed as the small social constituent of the whole nation. The central authority's aim in Japan, since the end of the nineteenth century, has been to consolidate its own power by centralising and

unifying the nation.[14] In this respect, people must contribute, and be subordinated to, superior interests represented by the State. Thus, the principle of "family state" prevails throughout the country, and is related to the need for national security against foreign threats. This principle plays a crucial role in the political ideology of the country.[15] At the end of the nineteenth-century, the Japanese government convinces its citizens that all Japanese belong to the "family state" by virtue of being both Japanese and Emperor's children; it is thus promoted in Japanese society at large that "all classes of Our people were told to act in unison, to be faithful to their callings, frugal in the management of their households, submissive to the dictates of conscience and calls of duty, frank and sincere in their manners" (qtd. in Jansen 489).[16] In this social atmosphere, individual fulfilments must be confined to society's requirements. It is only after the Second World War that this particular sense of 'home' or 'family' loses its validity. Abe's negation of "home" involves reflection upon this conventional sense of "home" in Japanese past history and upon the concept of *Heimat* in previous utopian and dystopian novels.

Consequently, Abe's approach to "home" is different from the other dystopian writers'. In *Inter Ice Age 4*, "home" is depicted as the symbol of something which we take for granted, but this traditional meaning is subverted by the author insofar as he rejects the totalising force hidden behind this term. Likewise, he criticises the habitual sense of everyday life, since the notions of repetition and habit underlie a social order pertaining to a nationalistic mechanism. In other words, in Abe's view, to challenge such concepts as "home" and "the everyday" mean to investigate a sort of mannered sense of security. The "nomad" author's approach to the everyday is

---

[14] Cf. Jansen (483-9).

[15] See also Blocker and Starling (123, 131).

[16] When Japan is introduced to Western utopian writing, the statement in More's Utopia that "the whole island is like one big household" is highly valued as a suitable device for education. The social arrangements, as described in the novel, are considered as being appropriate to the state's ideal picture of the family. They strengthen the idea that the individual is a member of the society, performing a particular social role. It was particularly asserted that More's text encouraged not the "servitude" but the "service" of the individual for the sake of the community.

importantly related to his own creation of a future world.[17]

[17] Abe's particular concept of home can be compared with Orwell's and Burgess's life. A detachment from "home" gave these three writers not only motivations to be a writer but also opportunities to enhance their insight into human conditions. After living in Burma, Orwell has a strong resentment against British imperialism, and then develops a sharp criticism against the status quo. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a culmination of his various social experiences and reflects his political views. In the case of Burgess, his experience in a British colony shapes a more optimistic way of thinking, through which he learns to be sensitive towards human difference and diversity. Although their reactions to experiences in British colonies differ from each other, Orwell and Burgess realise that their prejudices were parts of the State's ideology. As well, both Orwell and Burgess eventually wish to resign from their respective positions and return to their "home". Strong attachment to "home" is, by contrast, lost in Abe's case.

A DECONSTRUCTED CONCEPT OF THE EVERYDAY

When we compare them with the Modernist approach to everyday life, we may built up the hypothesis that the conventional utopian writers have tended to focus on only one side of everyday life, "a realm of generality" described as being a direct result of the determining power from above. Their texts display a totalised and ordered society, whose mechanism is determined by an omnipotent legislator. Dystopia, by contrast, questions utopia's forms of governance and its aim to regulate the individual's everyday life. Personal feeling, such as agony, frustration, jealousy, confusion, love and apathy, represent the dystopian counterattack against conventional utopian narratives, as seen in Kuno in E. M. Forster's "The Machine Stops" (1926), in the Savage in Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World* (1932) and in Winston Smith in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949). Whereas utopian novels portray the everyday life as integrated into a unity, dystopian writers stress the neglected feelings of individuals and show how personal sensitivity constitutes a subversive power against a social uniform order. The negative, pessimistic endings of dystopian novels imply that these individuals' quotidian feelings are treated less important. In other words, dystopian writers depict the force and validity of a centralised social power as inescapable. This is most tellingly inferred in their endings. In the end, these dystopian writers describe the death of the protagonist who is unable to break through his existing society. Subsequently, the random and uncertain feelings of individuals are only depicted in order to highlight the protagonist's oppositional deviances. Traditionally, neither utopian or dystopian writers work out a solution to heal the rupture between the microscopic approach to everyday life and the macro aspect of the everyday as a realm of governance.

Abe distances himself from previous writers of this genre through a different approach to the everyday. Based on both the micro-analysis of the everyday life and the macro-approach of ordering governance, his views stress the complexity of the world. Thus, *Inter Ice Age 4* demonstrates how an individual experience is bound to supra-individual spheres, such as the environmental crises and the global financial markets of capitalism.

The novel's main character is not particularly distinguished in society, for no heroic characters are necessary for the description of everyday life. *Dr Katsumi* is an archetype of a man belonging to the middle-class in post-war Japan, where the great majority of Japanese identify themselves with the middle class (Jansen 743). In this social atmosphere, the consciousness of a social crisis is uncommon. Compared to Akutagawa Ryunosuke's dystopia, *Kappa* (1927), which overtly criticises the unfair social system of contemporary Japan, such allusions to political and social problems are less clear in Abe's text. (In Akutagawa's short novel, the lower class suffers in poverty and is even "eaten" by the privileged class.) Besides, in Abe's novel, there are few signs of revolution by those who are oppressed in society, nor a fear of change in those who possess the power. Instead, the author highlights Dr Katsumi's ordinary day-to-day life, which is almost typical of that of the middle-class. The scientist finds some pleasure purely in his scientific experiments, and he is less concerned about the possible effects of his computer project on the life of humankind at large (*IIA4* 98). Unlike Winston Smith in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Katsumi does not think of himself as isolated and different; nor is he like Alex in *A Clockwork Orange*, who complains and rebels against the status quo. Katsumi is an ordinary man like Duncan in Gray's *Lanark*; yet, the middle-aged protagonist has little contempt for his social status and conditions and enjoys his little world and the small fame which he earns on account of his scientific project. He has no anxiety about carrying out the routines of his everyday life.

As we have seen earlier, Katsumi's sense of security is suddenly threatened by enigmatic and disparate incidents. Abe questions our habitual perceptions of the everyday life by using the form of a detective story. According to the literary critic Ihab Hassan, "the detective plot is being used to express not order but the irrationality of both the surface of the world and of its deep structure" (qtd. in Rose 271). The detective plot is used in Abe's novel to show how Katsumi's strong beliefs in rationality and totality are destabilised by various incidents. From the beginning of the story, we find the scientist's preoccupation with rationality. His world must be perfectly organised and totalised; nothing can deviate from his unified vision of life.

Common things in everyday life must exist in harmony. Looking at the view of the outside, Katsumi thinks: "There is always order in the distant view, no matter how strange the happening, it can never project from the frame, from the order which this distant view possesses" (*IIA4* 85-6). Yet, his beliefs, based on rational logic, are unable to understand the illogical and contradictory facts to which he is confronted. After his involvement in incredible incidents, he is confused insofar as he cannot find any reason or cause explaining them. He is dismayed by these events which do not respect the rational rules of probability: "Clearly the origin of this pain lay in the fact that the train of events that had suddenly occurred seemed quite to ignore the general rule that events always develop in the direction of the greatest possibility" (*IIA4* 78). Katsumi identifies himself with a train running on the track which never deviates from its route. A train running off from the track gives "intolerable" pain to his "rational sense" (*Ibid.*). Thus, such a pain becomes all the stronger when his rational beliefs are shattered by a series of incidents which look irrelevant with each other—computer forecast, a murder, women's abortion, and the metamorphosis of an embryo. He desperately tries to rationalise the relationship between these things, and to connect them to each other. When Katsumi concludes that his assistant Tanomogi must be the murderer, the young assistant ironically replies: "It was an interesting conjecture, rational, very much like you, sir" (91). Katsumi's belief in a rational and logical relation between cause and effect is challenged by incredible events which disintegrate his rational prejudices.

Then the novel moves on to the question as to what extent Katsumi can break through his own perceptions of everyday life. In other words, the novel suggests that human life is discontinuous since composed of unexpected contingencies. The reader follows the collapse of the protagonist's rational image of world on account of the irrational forces of contingent incidents. Accordingly, the readers' belief that the everyday life is secured and repetitious is dissolved at the same time as Katsumi is faced with irrational incidents, such as the creation of the aquans, a submarine enterprise, or an enigmatic voice on the phone which turns out to be Katsumi's voice itself. In opposition to the idea of Dr Katsumi, the novel suggests that everyday life

consists of fragmented elements constituting a mosaic of small units which do not form a rational totality.

Abe's deconstructive approach to totality derives from his enthusiasm for 1950s Russian montage films. In his review of Mikhail Kalatozov's *The Cranes are Flying* (1957), he emphasises the importance of the montage technique as a new way of representing modern life. Indeed, Abe is one of the very few critics in Japanese society who value this film technique around this time. He argues that conventional plots are no longer appropriate, insofar as they evolve around only one aspect of reality and end up with a closed ending. The implication of his argument is his negation of Realism as used in both Western Realism and conventional Japanese I-novel.[1] Abe considers that reality cannot be represented through only one viewpoint, except for pedagogical purposes (1958: 146-7). Instead the author finds the practice of montage, which suggests that no single perspective or mode of presentation is ultimately privileged, a more appropriate way to offer what art provokes in each reader's consciousness.

Likewise, Abe describes his novel as "something like a tent": a tent looks like a solid building outwardly, but the inside of it is empty, and in it there is no fixed content. He explains in an interview with Oe Kenzaburo in 1992:

> In the case of a normal building, generally, we are apt to believe that the structure and the arrangement within it correspond to the exterior looking. Therefore, one can imagine from the outside how the contents inside the building are arranged. I am not interested at all in creating such a kind of fiction. What I aim at is a novel like a labyrinth, in which various fragmented images are independent and arbitrary, whereby a horizontal line can be looked at as a vertical line at the same time. (245)

His readers are asked to discover and grasp the fragmented meanings of the work in which nothing plays a determining role in communication and representation. As Annie Checci (1990) argues, Abe presents "the fiction consisted of words" (235) in which the signifier and the signified are not necessarily related to each other. This

---

[1] "I-novel" ("*Shi-shosetsu*") in Japanese literature refers to novels written in the first person in an autobiographical way. About a detailed account of this genre, see Chapter V.

suggests that the interpretations of the work are diverse, never reaching one absolute conclusion. This is due to the plural and contradictory aspects of the everyday life.

Inter Ice Age 4 has multiple narratives to which no reading guide is applied. The "imcompleteness" of the novel is shaped by Abe's use of Modernist techniques. In particular, he describes reality through Surrealism. The reflection upon two world wars leads to the Surrealists' claim that "the West's obsession with technological advance and the over-estimation of reason at the expense of feeling led straight to destructive megalomania" (Short 293). Moreover, the novelists of Modernism aim to unveil the "concealed" patterns of daily life in order to question "the sleep-walking demeanour inspired by the tyranny of habit" (Felski 25). Modernist writers explore ways to express their criticism of habitual consciousness, and tries to "redeem the everyday by rescuing it from its opacity, de-familiarising it and making us newly attentive to its mysteries" (ibid. 26).[2] Nowadays, some believe that Surrealism still provides a suggestive psychological approach to everyday life. Georges Perec in his "Approaches to What?" (1973) is, among others, interested in a "surreal take" on the society as a whole. He holds that, as far as no single perspective or mode of presentation can be privileged, a kind of "surreal take" on our life investigates the banal, the quotidian, the common and the ordinary, and is the best measure to consider our life. Perec writes, "We sleep through our lives in a dreamless sleep. But where is our life? Where is our body? Where is our space?" (177). Surrealists provoke new sensations and perceptions about life itself; and developing a surrealist enquiry into what we take for granted in a fixed image of life, Abe questions the dependence on rationality, totality, and logic in the everyday life.[3]

In *Inter Ice Age 4* the author highlights this "incompleteness" by applying the artistic devices of "de-familiarisation" and "estrangement".[4] Through these

---

[2] Peter Brigg writes that Surrealists' use of "powerful symbols in usual juxtapositions" demands "a good deal of personal interpretation" of each reader and viewer (15).

[3] Abe's fiction may have a similar sensibility to that of J.G. Ballard's novel. Note the comment on the novels written by Ballard: "So, we have to invent, turn the acceptable, normal world upside down before we can be secure. Ballard's stories repeatedly advice us to 'invert' our logic which presumably represents for Ballard Western technological thinking and values" (Perry and Wikei 103).

[4] For a detailed account of this term, see Chapter I.

techniques, his readers are ultimately required to challenge what they believe to be real and true. The German playwright Bertolt Brecht, who is the pioneer of the epic theatre as an art of "defamiliarisation", writes:

> Before familiarity can turn into awareness the familiar must be stripped of its inconspicuousness; we must give up assuming that the object in question needs no explanation. However frequently recurrent, modest, vulgar it may be it will now be labelled as something unusual. (qtd. in Highmore 21)

Referring to Brecht's epic theatre, Fredric Jameson (1998) argues that "the theory of estrangement, which always takes off from the numbness and familiarity of everyday life, must always estrange us from the everyday" (84). Abe's *Yamamoto*, the scientist working on metamorphosis, implies that any value judgements about the present and the future are arbitrary, since they are never subordinated to a fixed point of view:

> I hear that when certain primitive natives in Africa first came to the city and saw the tall buildings, they took them for human slaughterhouses. Well, sorry, don't take me too literally. What I mean is, something whose connection with human experience we cannot grasp is bound to be frightening. Something that's meaningless but stronger than we are. (*IIA4* 120)

What is normal and natural for an individual may turn out to be strange and unnatural following another point of view. The effect of surprise caused by the method of "estrangement" aims to liberate readers from the conventional and limited framework of logical thinking. Ultimately, our petrified, rational consciousness of everyday living opens up.

The adaptation of these literary techniques bespeaks Abe's departure from the conventional notion of authorship. The novelist Oe Kenzaburo (1992) highly values Abe's concept of authorship in his comparison with Gaston Bachelard's "imagination", arguing that both writers offer no clear semantic destinations to readers (74). The novelist and the philosopher refuse to create a novel with a unique ideology and discourse on morality; rather, each produces a hermeneutic novel, through which readers are asked to discover a meaning by themselves. While

proletarian writers prefer totalised narratives, which indicates their overestimation of a legitimate authorship, Abe denies a conventional role for the author and questions to what extent consensual validation of judgements can be stabilised by the author. In several essays, he rejects the dominant idea that the author is at the centre in the process of creation. Rather he claims that the author is, in the extreme case, "the guide, faithful servant, tireless slave, innocent and talented consultant, and productive machine which can never complain and verify his novel" (1964: 21-22). Thus, the meanings of a novel are not caused by the author's intentions. Abe's idea about the role of author is close to Alain Robbe-Grillet's in *For a New Novel: Essays on Fiction* (1963). As a pioneer of the so-called postmodern fiction, Robbe-Grillet questions the traditional literary method of Realism and explores some new aesthetic representations in literature.[5] The French author puts it:

> For, far from neglecting him, the author today proclaims his absolute need of the reader's cooperation, an active, conscious, *creative* assistance. What he asks of him is no longer to receive ready-made a world completed, full, closed upon itself, but on the contrary to participate in a creation, to invent in his turn the world—and the world—and thus to learn to invent this own life. (1963: 156)

To become a "creative" assistant, Abe's reader is required to detect a subtle "noise" in the whole text, as Ihab Hassan (1996) provides us with a suggestion for the reading of Abe's work: "[If] you can't hear the noise of the world—or transfix its madness with your gaze—the world itself may dissolve" (35). The "noise", which is expected to be heard by readers with intuition, underlies Abe's purpose of making his narrative. In the Postscript of *Inter Ice Age 4*, the author states: "(Yet) I shall have fulfilled one of the purposes of this novel if I have been able to make the reader confront the cruelty of the future, produce within him anguish and strain, and bring about a dialogue with himself" (*IIA4* 228). Like Robbe-Grillet, Abe is aware that the interpretation of his novel is open to the reader's active and creative collaboration. Decentred meanings in the novel, along with the illegitimacy of authorship, imply that utopia or dystopia should not be formed as a perfect and final dream, since there

---

[5] The literary critic Ihab Hassan (1996) considers Abe to be a postmodern writer (33-34).

are no absolute and intangible "foundations". In this, the technique of "defamiliarisation" effectively works in his novel. Unlike Orwell, Abe does not expect that the meanings of the society he depicts should always be conveyed to his readers according to his own wish. His view that there is no single perspective provides us with the stimulating idea inferring that utopian and dystopian literatures are reaching a new stage. This is reflected in Abe's way of imagining the future, as we will argue in the following section.

THE FUTURE THROUGH A SENSE OF CONTINGENCY

Abe's own approach to the concept of totality is resonant to his negation of the idea that the future is immanent in the present. In the Postscript of *Inter Ice Age 4*, Abe writes that the novel "ends with the death of this sense of continuity" (227). That is, the narrative ends with Dr Katsumi's death, which symbolises the death of the rational thought that the future merely derives from a sequence of our present everyday life. It is the death of the protagonist who believes it possible that the image of the future can be rationally measured by a computer. In his theory, to foresee the future is based upon a repetition of everyday life through a measurement:

> For example, in such a case, if one takes action on the basis of knowing one prediction, the another prediction has to be made. That is, a second prediction. And then if that is made public, a third one must be made, and so on ad infinitum. The last prediction is what we call the prediction of maximum value. You should understand that normally we select the mean between the first prediction and the final one. (*IIA4* 17-8)

Then possible image of the future is calculated as the greatest common divisor of numerous possible causes. As discussed in the previous section, Katsumi has no doubt about his view that each effect has a unique cause, and that the linear movement from the present to the future means that the future is immanent in the numerous possibilities of the present.

However, we have seen that Katsumi is perplexed by facing "the combination of happenstances" in which there appears to be no apparent coherence (*IIA4* 83). These unlikely and strange incidents are perceived by him as threats interrupting his scientific construction of the future. Thus, he desperately refuses the possibility of the contingent, since he regards the future as the final point of a linear progress through cyclical, repetitive "everydays". It is unacceptable for him to acknowledge that the future cannot be imagined as a totalising image and also, conversely, that it is always in defiance of a rationalised order and occurs suddenly out of the transgressions of everyday life.

However, Katsumi becomes aware of the vulnerability of his theory when he visits Dr Yamamoto's laboratory. The biologist's hypothesis is powerful enough to

provide an alternative assumption. Yamamoto points out that human history consists in the accumulation of contingent events. He explains that the production of the aquans, the metamorphosis of foetuses, is thus a part of a phenomenon called "a composite feedback", namely a process which deconstructs the repetitive development of the family line (118).[1] Dr Yamamoto explains:

> In evolutionary theory the principle of interrelation is a very important one. According to this law, change in a single organ of a living creature necessarily provokes change in other organs. We're not merely concerned with being able to repeat the past, with being able to repeat the life line of the species through the individual process, but with the necessity of forcing this life process ahead. (*IIA4* 123)

Dr Yamamoto's research contradicts Katsumi's beliefs. The existence of the aquans appears as the proof that subverts his viewpoint. He cannot help recognising: "Until just yesterday I had believed this everyday sense of continuity to be supremely trustworthy. But it was different now. If what I had seen last night was actual fact, I should have to admit, I suppose, that this everyday sense of mine was rather a lie that closely resembled reality. Everything was inside out" (141). The only possible way left to the inflexible protagonist is to kill his son. The action means to him the ultimate way to oppose the idea that the future is far removed from his imagination and judgement. By killing his future son, he tries to deny the unbelievable story about the aquans and to return to his "ordinary" life, and it is this decision that brings about his unexpected death.

The author infers the existence of those who can control the whole project of the creation of the aquans as well as the submarine world. When Katsumi asks Dr Yamamoto if his institution is under the jurisdiction of some government agency, Yamamoto gives an unclear answer, merely stating that all he knows is that the top structure is "powerful" since "they're in possession of the whole country" (*IIA4* 112-3). He also says that the new power is obscure, but all the more powerful by using networks of knowledge: "Since the farmers are very probably part of a single

---

[1] The scientific theory in this scene recalls Jacques Monod's *Le hasard et la necéssité* (1970). As a matter of fact, Nancy Shields (1997) points out that Abe was interested in Monod's theories.

organization, they're obviously a profitable enterprise" (133). In the novel, the source of authorised power controlling the submarine enterprise is the capitalist power defined through a global economy run by borderless companies. The group of borderless companies embark on the secret project of constructing a submarine world and launch the Society for the Development of Submarine Colonies when they know that that the rise of the sea level will be caused by not only global warming but also a cataclysm (*IIA4* 191-2).

Inter Ice Age 4 describes a new mode of "governmentality" in late capitalism, in which the former relationship between the controller and the controlled becomes more complicated. The novel aims to stress that those who possess power are companies that control knowledge. A computerised society is not controlled by a single political or social authority, but by a single kind of knowledge which becomes the dominant factor in the world. Thus, nation-states must fight against growing multinational corporations in order to be sure that knowledge is shared by a maximum amount of players.[2] This is relevant to what Michel Foucault terms "biopolitics", which emerges in the 1950s and 60s ("The Risks of Security" 366). This new form of governmentality is achieved through modern science, as capitalistic societies control individuals by targeting the human body. Foucault writes: "[Capitalism] …started by socializing a first object, the body, as a factor of productive force, of labour power. Society's control over individuals was accomplished not only through consciousness or ideology but also in the body and with the body" ("The Birth of Social Medicine" 137). The modern nation makes the individual's subordination to society possible through medical treatments. In Abe's fiction, women undertaking abortion can be interpreted as the object of this kind of "biopolitics". While medical progress is justified through women's right and freedom of choice, governmentality is reached through women's "dependency" on the technology allowed by a state law. In Foucault's view, "the individual never questioned his relationship to the State, in so far as this relationship (keeping in mind

---

[2] Cf. Terry Eagleton's *Literary Theory* (1983: 124) and Tom Moylan's *Scraps of the Untainted Sky* (2000: 141-44).

the way in which the great centralizing institutions worked) was based on an 'input'—the dues he paid—and an 'output'—the benefits that accrued to him" ("The Risks of Security" 367). Patients gain "security" through an "entire mechanism of social protection", but they loose a degree of "autonomy". Thus Foucault argues that these individuals in fact do not receive any benefit as far as they are still integrated into "a family milieu, a work milieu, or a geographical milieu" (ibid.).

Abe radicalises the patients' dependence on scientific progress in order to show the strengthened power of govermentality. The intricacy is higher when the market economy is integrated into this sphere. Indeed, those who carry out abortions receive money in exchange for the embryos and also for introducing new patients. They know that a medical institution needs embryos for their experiment in creating a new species, i.e. the aquans; they do not feel guilty insofar as they feel that they comply with an administrative request. The novel shows how individuals blindly trust social and medical institutions. At the same time, we find the young mistress of the murdered man frantically imploring that she will be in serious trouble if she divulgates some information (*IIA4* 61-2). What belongs to "biopolitics" is more strengthened by their own awareness that these women conspire with the confidential yet powerful organisation. Dr Yamamto explains that their power is unseen, yet is ubiquitously and perfectly organised, despite the fact that there is no "law" formulated by them (113).[3]

As Abe articulates in the Postscript, Katsumi must eventually be killed because of his unshakable conviction concerning the connection between the past and the present. Dr Katsumi is given a "verdict of death" by some people who confidentially embark on the project of the submarine farm in the aquans' world. Katsumi must be 'vaporised' for the reason that he does not accept the fact that his son will be transformed into an aquan, i.e. an inhabitant of the future world. Being unable to approve a future that he does not understand, Katsumi desperately plans to cut off the

---

[3] Dr Yamamoto says: "As I have already said, the work in this laboratory requires secrecy.... Of course, there's no law or anything. We don't ask you to put your signature on any oath, and there are no formal restrictions. However, the screening is consequently all the more severe" (*IIA4* 113-4).

connection with such an unlikely future by killing his embryo. He is then given a death sentence owing to his failure to pass "a test to see to what point he could tolerate a future cut off from the past" (*IIA4* 166).

To imagine the future as irrelevant to the present can be interpreted, to some extent, as a trait of cultural and philosophical mode of Modernism. Writers of Modernism accuse of passivity those who think of the future as a repetition of the everyday life. Rita Felski identifies this attitude with "laziness, conservatism, or bad faith", arguing that "this disdain for repetition fuels existentialism's critique of the unthinking routine of everyday life, its insistence on the importance of creating oneself anew at each moment" (20). Modernism attempts to liberate us from our habitual perceptions, and emphasises that repetition is a behaviour which limits our view of life. In a similar way, Katsumi's attitude towards the everyday life is treated as the target for severe criticisms. His over-reliance on repetition in his own everyday life is ultimately denounced as a menace to the future of humanity.

The question as to whether the future can be considered as a continuity of the everyday leads us to a crucial consideration on how we make futuristic images in utopian and dystopian novels. For, in both conventional utopian and dystopian novels, the future has been depicted as being immanent in the present, meaning that the future represents a continuity of the everyday life. Thus, the nightmare of Orwell's dystopia is portrayed as a possible future directly connected to the present situation. Winston Smith in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* desperately searches for any traces of the past, which he associates with solid, objective truths. The discovery of a paperweight in a junk shop excites him, as it is an objective proof of the past. He says: "I don't think it was ever put to any use. That's what I like about it. It's a little chunk of history that they've forgotten to alter. It's a message from a hundred years ago, if one knows how to read it" (*1984* 152).[4] Past and present are bonded together; and Orwell's text suggests that a vulnerable present affects the future. In contrast, *Inter*

---

[4] The relationship between the past and the present is stressed by Orwell's (1945) review of classic utopias. He assesses Samuel Butler's *Erewhon* as an important utopian fiction of the nineteenth century on the grounds that the novel describes temporal chains of cause and effect (*CWEO* 170).

Ice Age 4 challenges this teleological discourse, in the sense that the future should not be determined by what is present.

Abe expresses his scepticism towards the possibility of defining an utopian or dystopian vision of the future. He questions the legitimacy of the utopian and dystopian writers' imagination. To him, it is purposeless to speculate over a positive or negative future and it is impossible to presume what the future will be. In the Postscript of *Inter Ice Age 4*, Abe writes:

> The controversy about whether the future is affirmative or negative has been going on for many years. Numerous literary works have expressed an affirmative world image or a negative one by using the form of the future. I, however, have taken neither the one nor the other course. In fact, it is extremely doubtful whether one has the right to sit in judgement of the values of the future. I believe that if one does not have the right to deny a given future, neither does he have the right to affirm it. (226)

Hence the future should be considered as "a thing" standing beyond an unreachable abyss (*IIA4* 226). The novel highlights the irrelevancy between the present and the future through the miscommunication between the aquans and their mothers. The novel illustrates the aquans living in defiance of people living in the present. Such "cruelty" of the future is seen when the aquans always disappoint human expectations. A movement develops among land mothers who wish to maintain "close contact with their children". Whereas the aquans are unable to comprehend their mothers' desire (because they have now a different way of expression) and completely ignore their request (215). The present is ignored from the future's point of view, except that the vestige of the past world is a popular tourist spot. Tokyo is preserved as a symbol of the old non-rational era; the inhabitants of the future enjoy watching these "strange" things of the past, whose life is beyond their comprehension.

Abe's idea about imagining the future has an affinity with the postmodern notion of time. In other words, Abe's story is a good example of postmodern fiction

which follows after Modernism.[5] Postmodernism defines life as discontinuous, such that the future cannot be defined as immanent in the present. Therefore, postmodern consciousness challenges the utopian blueprint of the ideal society in the name of irrational contingency. Postmodernists' perspective for contingency leads to the argument that utopia's conventional technique of offering only one possible blueprint is fraught with the danger of totalitarianism.[6] "If postmodernism means anything at all", Dick Hebdige writes, in "A Report on the Western Front: Postmodernism and the 'Politics' of Style" (1986-7), "it means an end to a belief in coherence and continuity as givens, an end to the metaphysic of narrative closure" (337). He goes on to write:

> It may mean at worst substituting history as a game of chance for the older, positivist models of productive causality. less [sic] fatalistically, it may mean substituting a history without guarantees for the older models of mechanical and "necessary" progress. The choice is still there even in the nuclear age: history as a sound and fury signifying nothing or history as a desperate struggle to snatch back reason with a small "r" from the jaws of desperation. (338)

This notion of history questions utopian writing since postmodernism rejects the connection of the past, present and future. In a similar way to postmodern consciousness, Abe's plot, which is comprised of contingency and fragmentation, negates the linear movement of time and, therefore, future cannot be assumed from the present.

Abe's approach to the rise of computer technology foresees the transformation of knowledge that Lyotard (1979) focuses on; it takes place in the whole mode of collecting and communicating social information, which leads to the era in which "the storage of knowledge" becomes the crucial issue for controlling the world. This marks the end of "the sacred aura" of Modernist conceptions of knowledge and science, where there is "no place today for a view of knowledge which sees it as a privileged unified body of mental 'thought' which exists in the collective Mind"

---

[5] On such a definition of postmodernism, see Brian McHale (1992) and Randall Stevenson (1991).
[6] Cf. Introduction to this thesis.

(Mclennan 333). Lyotard argues that knowledge nowadays corresponds to an array of "moves" in "language games", and all of which are targeted to specific groups of people. In this respect, each group possesses a fragment of knowledge as an economic commodity, as required by the market economy. Knowledge is no longer defined as a universal set of rational principles; it is rather exploited for practical purposes, such that its practicality makes it relative, specific, and indifferent to a global picture. Thus, indubitable foundations and true legislations have become prejudice of the past.

Both Abe and Lyotard define knowledge as shaping the world structure; yet, the former seems to be, unlike the latter, more conscious of the existence of universal problems. As Ben Highmore (2002) points out, Lyotard's argument is apt to entail a danger of being misunderstood because of its excessive negation of the sense of totality in society at large (14). Moreover, his relativistic argument about "language games" may be taken as the idea that each group of people, society, ethnicity, etc., is, after all, content with its own limited sphere of life. Thus Kristin Ross (1995) claims that reflection upon the personal should be deemed as a source for the consideration of universal, global issues. Her standpoint is close to Abe's logic of collectivity, which means that everyday life is bounded to global issues. Thus, everyday life is by no means detached from the worlds of politics and economics. There is no established borderline, as seen in Abe's plot itself which first pulls all the units apart and then exhibits the connections between them. Also, the catastrophe of Katsumi represents that the individual's everyday life cannot be safely protected from the outside's threat. In this, Abe deals with the ethical issues of collectivity by uniting them with the individual's responsibility. Katsumi is involved in unexpected accidents through which he recognises powerfulness and feels profound isolation. The novel infers that his tragic ending is caused by his individualistic passivity, what Abe criticises as "irresponsibility". Katsumi's death is attributable to his "irresponsible" desire to distance himself from the world, i.e. from social and political problems outside, and to protect himself from the "cruelty" of the

unbelievable future by denying the connection with his aborted and transformed embryo.

Giving careful attention to the logic of everyday life, Abe questions readers as to what extent we can tolerate the unimaginable future and its logic of collectivity. The issue here can be also replaced by the question as to what extent we can abandon the long held notion of the hierarchy between superiority and subordination. On one hand, Katsumi regards the aquans as "slaves" educated and dominated by men. On the other hand, Tanomogi refutes this idea, saying, "in any period men are continually being born from the slaves" (*IIA4* 210). Yet, the picture of the aquans' world, which Katsumi witnesses before his death, displays a complete reversal of the hierarchy between the aquans and humankind, since humans are shown to be unable to live without the distribution of foods from the aquans. The legacy of humankind is satirically forgotten by the inhabitants of the future. Abel portrays a future world in which any established hierarchies of the present are collapsed; rather, his novel proposes the return to a pure idea of humankind, in which social and cultural discriminations have disappeared. The aquans' world is a type of community based on self-sufficiency in the absence of the State's governance. This future vision in *Inter Ice Age 4* can be examined in terms of what Fredric Jameson (1994) considers to be "utopia's basic concern":

> The ideals of Utopian living involve the imagination in a contradictory project, since they presumably aim at illustrating and exercising that much-abused concept of freedom that, virtually by definition and in its very structure, cannot be defined in advance, let alone exemplified: if you know already what your longed-for exercise in a not-yet-existent freedom looks like, then the suspicion arises that it may not really express freedom after all but only repetition; while the fear of projection, of sullying an open future with our own deformed and repressed social habits in the present, is a perpetual threat to the indulgence of fantasies of the future collectivity. (56-7)

Therefore, the future in Abe's text is depicted as something like a "chance" which emerges by accident. The impossibility for imagination to define a unique future implies that human desire to explore something new would never stop.

By the same token, it is indicated in the end of the narrative that Abe's deconstructive approach to life is never completed. For his novel carefully suggests that the world of the aquans may not last eternally. Indeed, the aquans suffer from "land sickness", whose treatment is never discovered except for an accident. As well, Abe portrays a young aquan who is fascinated by the world of the past, and, in contrast with his own submarine life, thinks of the world of the land as "a world of fabulous dreams, an unreal world" (*IIA4* 219). The young aquan's curiosity with the land is caused by an "accident"; as an apprentice in the submarine oil fields, this young aquan assists in the repair of the radio tower belonging to the concession. He "happens" to surface without his air suit, and becomes unable to forget "the strange sensation" he has experienced (219). This experience eventually provokes in him further thoughts about the past world. He eventually decides to visit the world of the past by breaking the "taboo" in his society. In defiance of the social norm that "discovery [means] punishment", the young aquan seeks the world of the land. Yet the reward he has to pay in exchange for his desire and free choice is large; in the end, we find him dying on the land. His death illustrates the dramatic quest for the unknown. The fates of Dr Katsumi and the young aquan (they both die in the end) show the difficulty for any individuals in finding their own place in a new world. It must be noticed that Abe deliberately writes the final sentence of *Inter Ice Age 4* in the present tense: "Outside the door the footstep stops".[7] His use of the present tense shows that the present life is always unfinished and open to exploration. The future is often "cruel" to those living in the present, but the Postscript of the novel insists that such cruelty challenges our habitual and nullified sense of the everyday: "We must be clearly aware that there is real evil in the very common place order of things we call everyday living" (227).

Abe's *Inter Ice Age 4* refutes Krishan Kumar's pessimistic comment (1987) that utopian literature is today in decline because contemporary utopian writers are likely to retreat into private worlds at the expense of the outer public domain. Kumar's

---

[7] However, the translator does not seem to be aware of this, since he translates the final sentence in the past tense.

negative valuation of these new utopian novels is related to his nostalgia for the era of "a big idea" through which writers visualise "a whole society ordered according to some principle of rightness and goodness" (1987: 420). The novel overthrows Kumar's view by suggesting that the thought of a private world is by no means a sign of "modest" and "limited" capability on the author's part. Rather, Abe's approach to the everyday brings about a new theme in utopian literature, namely, personal matters are certainly political. In *Inter Ice Age 4* the everyday life is concerned with human beings in their most universal condition.

Chapter V
Egalitarian, Agrarian Utopia in Inoue Hisashi's Kirikirijin

Inoue Hisashi's *Kirikirijin* (*The Kirikirians*) (1981) is a utopian novel of great length, which builds its narrative on the fictional supposition that a small village, called "Kirikiri", in the Tohoku region of Japan (northern Japan) has declared its independence from the country.[1] The novel portrays the revolutionary movement of the people in Kirikiri. The fictional village is represented as a typical of the area which has been disregarded as backward in the process of Japan's economic development. The novel starts with the Kirikirians' hijack of a Tohoku-bound train at the borders of their village. One of the passengers of the train is the middle-aged writer, Furuhashi Kenji; he is in search of a high-school teacher who has presented a sensational academic essay about the mythical existence of gold buried in the district. Most of the story is narrated from Furuhashi's perspective, through which we find the Kirkirians in the small village challenging Tokyo's official culture and social norms in their forty-four-hour-long revolution. What the villagers aim to achieve are genuine changes in their life through revolution, and to celebrate their unique life-style based on their indigenous values. As a result, they illustrate the process of constructing a utopian community of egalitarianism and agrarianism in a beautiful countryside.[2]

The first section of this chapter will deal with the forms and styles of Inoue's work; in particular, Inoue's novel expresses a "carnivalesque" disorder, as theorised by Bakhtin, which means to challenge the totalising social powers. The second section will examine the Kirikiri revolution, namely the creation of a small agrarian

---

[1] Inoue devoted almost ten years for the creation of this novel. *Kirikirijin* has not been integrally translated into any languages. Therefore, most of the quotations present my own translation, except for some which are translated by Joel Cohn (1998). As well, the citations from interviews with Inoue are of my translation.

[2] *Kirikirijin* can be deemed as a good example of the utopian novels in the 1980s. In his *Scraps of the Untainted Sky* (2000), Tom Moylan describes a new mode of utopian novels which emerged in the 1980s as follows: "Atwood writes from the perspective of the 1980s, having seen, at least for a few years in the 1960s and 1970s, the false utopias of big states and big ideas yield their power to the grassroots utopian opposition of popular movements (fighting for racial liberation, stopping a war, taking control of one's body and one's self" (164).

utopia. Notice that *Kirikirijin*, compared with the five other novels discussed in this thesis, provides the most detailed utopian scheme. Finally, the third section of this chapter will focus on the Kirikirians' ambition of defining small histories as opposed to the grand history of Japanese society, mainly because such communitarian histories have been neglected by Japanese historiography.

THE CARNIVALESQUE, PARODY, AND THE COMIC SPIRIT REVIVED

Kirikirjin, which was given both the Yomiuri award and an award for Science Fiction writing in the year it was published, marks the rise of a new era of literature in Japan, becoming an outstanding example of the postwar utopias which "subvert the consensus reality of modern Japan on a variety of levels" (Napier 165). Whereas previous writers (in particular Meiji era's writers) were likely to endorse the political ideology of the society, the post-war authors of Japanese utopian literature locate themselves on the margins of society and write "new political novels" which refutes the national policies.[3] By re-examining the traditional relationship between an author and his or her society in Japanese literature, Inoue illustrates in his imaginative novel the life of the people who crave a small egalitarian and agrarian utopia, the positive re-discovery of powers of a marginalised people, and the multiplicity of Japanese society and culture. This is the deconstruction of the generally held myth that Japan presents a uniform society.

The novel depicts the Kirikirians' counterattack against the official culture of Japan. The text's portrayal of the revolutionary villagers presents a carnivalesque disorder. The notion of the "carnivalesque" is most notably described in Mikhail Bakhtin's writings, in particular *Rabelais and his World* (1968). Working on the carnivals of the Middle-Ages and the Renaissance, Bakhtin construes the carnival as a form of popular counter-culture in opposition to the state official culture, and he terms as "carnivalesque" such manifestations. Thus, *Kirikirijin* portrays a fictional village disregarded as backward in the process of Japan's economic development, and its opposition to the existing order in art, politics and economics can be viewed

---

[3] Cf. Chapter IV of this thesis.

as carnivalesque. Inoue's characters celebrate a vernacular and original way of living; for instance, the actresses of the "Kirikiri National Theatre" are strippers in the sense that nudism is explained as a road to a new kind of civilisation. As an old man proudly states:

> If you follow the idea of Free Defecation all the way, you end up rejecting clothing, houses, pavement, automobiles, and airplanes.... Everyone, rich and poor, will just be human—you can't wear a medal when you're naked, so there will be no great people or lowly people any more. It's the same with nudism.... Our paths of approach are different, but we work toward the same goal: anticivilisation!" (*Kirikirijin* 674)[4]

By privileging what is regarded as taboo in Japanese society, the villagers ridicule the dominant habits, morality, and social norms of the country (*Kirikirijin* 95-6).

The narrative form *Kirikirijin* reflects the text's thematic concern. In the text, coherence in the narrative structure is rejected in favour of a loose narrative line which is constantly interrupting itself with digressions. These digressions pertain to the anti-hierarchical spirit of the text, suggesting that any episode in the novel symbolises a ceaseless conflict between social norms (viewed as agents of repression) and an alternative way against "common" sense. Bakhtin's theory defines an indissoluble link between the carnivalesque and the concept of "polyphony". The "polyphony" of many voices is considered to be essential in the operation of the carnivalesque. The polyphonic novel (whose origin Bakhtin believes to be in Dostoevsky's works) presents "a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousness". To him, language is not a neutral medium that passes casually into the private realm of an individual's mind; rather an individual character's "voice" transmits an ideology, representing particular social and cultural views. Bakhtin states that "all utterances are heteroglot in that they are functions of a matrix of forces practically impossible to recoup" (1981: 428). Accordingly, a text produces inner tensions, collaborations, and negotiations within the process of dialogue. In *After Bakhtin* (1990) the novelist and the literary critic David Lodge considers this

---

[4] This quotation is translated by Joel Cohn.

heterogeneous harmony to be a prerequisite in the writing of a novel:

> It was the destiny of the novel as a literary form to do justice to the inherent dialogism of language and culture by means of its discursive poplyphony, its subtle and complex interweaving of various types of speech—direct, indirect and doubly—oriented (e.g. parody)—and its carnivalesque irrelevance towards all kinds of authoritarian, repressive, monologic ideologies. (21)

In this respect, Inoue's *Kirikirijin* is the best instance of Bakhtin's polyphonic novel which offers a place of "dialogue" between fragmented individual voices.

The novel's "dialogism" and its egalitarianism are closely connected to the absence of a protagonist in the conventional meaning. A respect for the style of each individual's speech does not allow for a dominant narrative expressed by a main character's point of view. Although the novel is mostly narrated through Furuhashi, who happens to visit Kirikiri, he is a powerless protagonist who often gives way to other characters; and the other characters often become the "main" characters and nullify Furuhashi's position, whenever their speeches are given a few pages and paratgaphs. To highlight this effect, there is an unseen character called "a recorder", which pictures the Kirikiri revolution with a critical distance, giving the change of independence and autonomy to all the characters in the novel.

The novel as a place for "dialogue" includes many small conflicts on an everyday level, and, as Bakhtin writes, Inoue exhibits the text like a painting with many colours:

> For the prose artist the world is full of other people's words, among which he must be able to perceive with a very keen ear. He must introduce them into the plane of his own discourse, but in such a way that this plane is not destroyed. He works with a very rich verbal palette. (Bakhtin 1984: 200-1)

Through the "voices" in *Kirikirijin*, we find figures in representing law, politics, media, business, academia, cities, foreign culture, pop culture, and medicine. These voices are never mingled and combined into a single unity; on the contrary, they conflict with each other, asserting themselves independently. The loose narrative line

of Inoue's text interrupts itself with such independent voices, yet, at the same time, it is these heterogeneous voices that frame and enrich the novel's world. Thus polyphonic form resonates with the text's emphasis on the equality of the humans. David Lodge (1990) holds that the important implication of the ideas of the carnival and "dialogism" lies in its exploring an open system:

> The dialogic includes, but is not restricted to, the quoted verbal speech of characters. It also includes the relationship between the characters' discourses and the author's discourse (if represented in the text) and between all these discourses and other discourses outside the text, which are imitated or evoked or alluded to by means of doubly-oriented speech. It is of course true that everything in a novel is put there by the novelist—in this sense the literary text is not, like a real conversation, a totally open system. But it is Bakhtin's point that the variety of discourses in the novel prevents the novelist from imposing a single world-view upon his readers even if he wanted to. (22)

The polyphonic nature stresses the equality of all humans. Therefore, the novel's form implicitly criticises any kind of force unifying a verbal-ideological world.

Another important literary technique in Inoue's text is the use of parody. Carnivalesque and parody are closely related, since both imply the criticism of existing laws. Umberto Eco (1984) argues: "Without a valid law to break, carnival is impossible" (6). A carnival satirises rules and rituals. According to Simon Dentith's *Parody* (2000), parody "includes any cultural practice which provides a relatively polemical allusive imitation of another cultural production or practice" (9). Understood in this way, Inoue uses parody as an effective way to satirise and criticise "the valid law" stabilised by the official culture in Japan. It is highlighted from the beginning of the story that Kirikiri is a nation of parody, and the object of the parody is the mother country, i.e. Japan (*Kirikirijin* 28). The Kirikirian's vision of making the new country is based on their analysis Japan as their pre-text. As such, Inoue's use of parody purports to negate the centralised power.[5] Eventually, the Kirikirians aim to create a new country based on constitutional texts and international treaties (31, 44). The most important part of Kirikiri's constitution is Article 9 which pertains to an outright rejection of the military. Their way of using these pre-texts is aimed at

[5] See Maeda Ai (366).

nullifying the authorised power by the cynical use of laughter, so preventing the process through which the power has influence.

Likewise, the Kirikirians embark upon the *translation* of canonical novels of Japanese literature (such as the novels by Kawabada Yasunari and Dazai Osamu) into their satirical language. Inoue parodies the standard Japanese language (*hyojungo*) used in educational texts and official documents. In order to highlight the parodic purpose, the author deliberately juxtaposes two texts: the standard Japanese as a pre-text and Tohoku dialect, i.e. the language of northern Japan dubbed "*zu-zu-ben*", as a transformed text. Each narrative line of the text in the dialect is accompanied by *rubi*, a sort of phonetic sign. The sounds of *zu-zu-ben* on the reader's perception is unsettling, as this arrangement of the sub-text written in the phonetic sign interrupts the process of reading. It prevents them from reading the novel in the usual, conventional way.[6] His readers are constantly forced to be aware of a peripheral voice, which makes them aware of the existence of the Other. Since Inoue's text does not allow for the conventional way of reading, what we take for granted is always menaced and interrupted by the Other's voice.

Kirikiri's language derives from the lived experience of the villagers. It is rooted in the organic cycle of nature, which contrasts with standard Japanese whose futility and monotonousness are implied through the novel. *Kirikirijin* claims that the so-called official Japanese from Tokyo has been artificially produced by the Tokugawa shogunnate (1600-1868) and the Meiji government (1868-1912). In this respect, Inoue shares Oe Kenzaburo's (1970) critical view about the petrified consciousness of the Japanese in their use of the language. The novelist Oe holds that people living in post-war Japan are no longer interested in challenging the meaning of its language (285); Japanese people are criticised as being too passive, and Inoue satirises their indifference to their language by illustrating the Kirikirians' high

---

[6] In his interview of 1984, Inoue speaks of his justification for using the sign *rubi* (15). Miyoshi Masao (1991) assesses this literary experiment and argues that "the marginal and deformational 'zu-zu drawl' deflects the reader from the neutral flow of communication to the language of writing itself. The content must always be tested by the form." (27). Inoue's use of the vernacular language of northern Japan can be also approached from a theoretical view of Yves Chevrel (1995).

sensitivity to their language (*Kirikirijin* 75-6). Ethical and political issues are posed to Japanese readers, in particular, when the villagers in the novel ask to what extent any discourses such as the new Constitution after the second World War have been seriously considered.

Inoue's investigation into the formation of the standard language and insight into the Japanese language consciousness correspond to his question about the "civilisation" Japan finally achieves to. Inoue unveils how modern Japanese "civilisation" is related to the formation of the modern Japanese language. The lifelessness of standard Japanese, as depicted in the novel, underlies the decline and the callousness of Japan's civilisation. The monotonous and depthless tone of the official language is suggested through Furuhashi's poor capacity for his writing. Nominated as the first poet laureate in Kirikiri, his poem has, however, no power to attract an audience. Joel Cohn (1998) writes that Inoue "hears, sees, and feels words as concrete objects with lives of their own which in turn infuse life into and shape the contours of his works" (136). As the Kirikirians assert, their language is "their skin" and "their flesh", and their language is rooted in their real life of tradition and nature (ibid.). Their language signifies man's life itself and represents the coexistence and co-prosperity with nature. [7]

Inoue's satirical portrayal of contemporary Japanese society intends to show what Japan has lost in the process of modernisation. His criticism of today's Japanese society and its culture takes place in his review on Realism and the "I-Novel", both of which have been dominant in Japanese literature. According to him, Japanese writers since the Meiji period have been influenced by Western thinking and culture; at the same time, they have consolidated the tradition of the "I-novel" (*shishosetsu*), which is a reflexive fiction privileging "lived experience" and "sincerity" confirmed through personal (in most cases the author's) observations and experiences. Then, the writers of Realism and of "I-novel" have become so obsessed with their subject that they have developed a dogmatic attitude. As a result, any elements of fantasy have been excluded in favour of either scientific observation or

---

[7] See Maeda Ai (1990: 372).

personal experiences (1982: 20).[8]

Inoue connects the dullness of standard Japanese language with Japan's preoccupation with modernisation. In an interview with Yura (1982), he argues that Japanese people originally possessed a generous and humorous sensitivity, like the Kirikirians'; yet this has been lost with the Meiji era (22). He adds:

> The Japanese are not aware that each individual's language can be original and unique. The nation's small scale helps to consolidate absolutism and its control over the monolithic educational system, which has been working so well until now. … We must have the consciousness of the high complexity and multiplicity of the Japanese; otherwise our literature will become poor. (22-3)

Inoue considers that the impoverishment of the language has been caused by the disappearance of the comic spirit from literature. As well, Nakamura Mitsuo and Joel Cohn consider that the decline of comedy is accompanied by the growing domination of both the "I-novel" and novels of Realism. Since writers of the "I-novel" were unable to separate themselves from their fictional alter-egos in their texts, they did not find the space for creating an ironic distance or a comic view of the self (Cohn 25).

In contrast, Inoue aims to revitalise an earlier tradition of literature called *gesaku*, playful and comical writings which thrived in the Edo period (1600-1868). What characterises this literary genre is its comic spirit and its appeal to mass readership. *Gesaku* were varied as booklets of cartoons and historical novels; and the readership was also extremely varied going from illiterates to members of the imperial court (Keene 1999: 397-9). Most of the texts are explicitly designed to make

---

[8] The differences between Japanese Realism and Western Realism are discussed by Susan Napier (1996): "Writers such as Miyoshi Masao (1991) and Edward Fowler (1988) have pointed out that the Japanese view of the 'real' in general and literary realism in particular is markedly different from that of the West, even when Japanese writers were supposedly 'copying' Western realism, especially the Naturalist tradition. They point to the importance of the *shishosetsu* (loosely translated as autobiographical or confessional novel), which privileges 'lived experience' and 'sincerity' over the supposedly artificial constructs of Western realism. Fowler points out that the Japanese writer 'never had the faith in the authority of representation that his Western counterpart had' and that in Japan 'the notion of what is real or authentic is traditionally limited to personal observations and experiences'" (13).

the readers laugh through satire, and they are extremely popular insofar as reader can relate to feelings expressed in a familiar language.[9] Miyoshi Masao (1991) points out that the *gesaku* writings are "parodic, episodic, and self-referential"; he adds that *gesaku* has the power to threaten the existing regime: "[*Gesaku*] seems to sense the coming end to the [realisation] of the conflict between feudal restriction and bourgeois liberality. *Gesaku*, often taken to be a literature of decadence, is at the same time an expression of resistance and criticism, however modest its scale and impact" (19). Thus, in the latter part of the Edo period, they are under the surveillance of the central authority, and they disappear in the Meiji period due to the government's increasing hostility.[10] In his study of Japanese comedy, Joel Cohn (1998) writes:

> [The] dawn of the modern era paradoxically saw the high-low dichotomy that had become so firmly ingrained over a thousand years of aristocratic and samurai ascendancy reassert itself with a new vitality; and it continued to exert a powerful influence throughout the period of [modernisation]. (19).[11]

Accordingly, the decline of *gesaku* literature marked for many, and Inoue included, the deprivation of the comic spirit from Japanese literature and society.[12]

Influenced by *gesaku* writers, Inoue tries to revitalise the tradition of this playful literature by reviving the comic spirit in his writings. Thus, both *gesaku*'s colloquial style and its adaptation to everyday conversations are applied to *Kirikirijin*. Cohn (1998) points out the close relationship between Inoue's use of comedy and his carnivalesque social criticism: "[Underlying] his most frivolous-sounding gags and puns is an urge to upset the established order that echoes the 'spirit of resistance to

---

[9] See also Donald Keene (1999: 409-10).
[10] For further discussion of the historical context, see Keene (409).
[11] Donald Keen argues that writers became "anxious to dissociate themselves from the frivolous and by then worn-out fiction of the immediate past, used it with scorn of writings that lacked the psychological depth of the Western-influenced literature" (1999: 397).
[12] About the strength of comic spirit, see also Laurence Davies's "At Play in the Fields of Our Ford" (1999).

the age' that elevated Gennai's writing above that of his contemporaries" (139).[13]

The integration of comedy, parody and the carnivalesque in Inoue's novel is worthy of critical attention, for in its use of parody his novel may offer an interesting comparison with postmodernism's treatment of parody. One of the problems in the postmodern culture is the ambiguous position of parody within it. Major postmodernists, including Fredric Jameson and Jean Baudrillard, criticise parody as a lack of imagination. Parody is mostly identified by these critics with the function of pastiche. Yet, Inoue's novel refutes such a negative approach; the author's loyalty to traditional Japanese literature (i.e. *gesaku* writing) and his use of parody in the carnivalesque atmosphere lead to the revival of parody in the postmodern era.

As referred in the previous chapter (Chapter III), post-structuralists such as Roland Barthes and Julia Kristeva consider that a text consists of fragments, and therefore negates the author as its unique cause. Barthes in "Death of the Author" (1968) writes, "The text is a tissue of quotations drawn from the innumerable centres of culture" (146). Likewise, Kristeva's "Word, Dialogue and Novel" (1966) claims: "Every text builds itself up as a mosaic of quotations, and every text is the absorption and transformation of another text" (qtd. in Rose 1993: 178). Although their critical view derive from Bakthin's idea that the carnivalesque overthrows the power hierarchy, they tend to pay less attention to the comic spirit from the function of parody.

Opinions vary on the function of parody among postmodern critics such as Fredric Jameson, Jean Baudrillard and Zygmunt Bauman. Bauman and Baudrillard consider parody to be empty and blank in contemporary culture. Baudrillard defines the main feature of postmodern art through the use of parody, which he describes as "postmodern pastiche" (he even describes it as "degenerate pastiche"). This approach suggests that the French critic associates parody to what is called pastiche and negatively regards it as blind and non-intentional. While Baudrillard considers that there is no sense of mission or driving force in its use, Fredric Jameson in

---

[13] Hiraga Gennai was one of the most important figures of the *gesaku* literature of the Edo period. His creation of fantastic travels in imaginary countries are notable for their sarcastic humour.

"Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism" (1984) distinguishes between parody and pastiche. He identifies pastiche with "the imitation or, better still, the mimicry of other styles and particularly of the mannerism and stylistic twitches of other styles" (113-4). The following comment by Jameson shows that pastiche in his idea lacks intention and motivation which parody is originally supposed to have:

> Pastiche is, like parody, the imitation of a peculiar or unique style, the wearing of a stylistic mask, speech in a dead language; but it is a neutral practice of such mimicry, without parody's ulterior motive, without the satirical impulse, without laughter, without that still latent feeling that there exists something *normal* compared to which what is being imitated is rather comic, pastiche is blank parody, parody that has lost its sense of humour.... (1985: 114)

According to Jameson, parody is a critical practice (which he associates with modernism), whereas pastiche (as an exemplary item of postmodernism) is parody without any critical practice.

Then, for Jameson, postmodern condition engenders the disappearance of the individual subject. The "death of the subject" in modern capitalist society leads to the debate concerning "the death of imagination". As Richard Kearney in *The Wake of Imagination* (2001) states: "[In] many postmodern works the very distinction between artistic-image and commodity-image has virtually faded. The practice of parody and pastiche, while it frequently intends to subvert the *imaginaire* of contemporary 'late capitalist' society, often ends up being co-opted or assimilated" (4). Jameson's negative comment on postmodern pastiche is connected to his pessimistic view of "the end of utopia" in contemporary society. Despite his hope that there is still space for utopian imagination, his analysis of postmodernity results in a negative conclusion. The separation of the comic spirit from parody implies that parody has lost its power of subversion. As Umberto Eco insists in his essay on carnival, parody without comedy fails to perform the carnivalesque impulse of anti-hierarchy.

Nevertheless, some critics discover promising signs in contemporary writers' use of parody. Michel Foucault values the essence of the comic in Jorge Louis Borges's stories (Rose 1993: 187). Foucault in *The Order of Things* (first published

in 1966) praises the "laughter that shattered...all the familiar landmarks" of his thought, "the thought that bears the stamp of our age and our geography—breaking up all the ordered surfaces and all the planes with which we are accustomed to tame the wild profusion of existing things, and continuing long afterwards to disturb and threaten with collapse our age—old distinction between the Same and the Other" (48-9). As Foucault emphasises, the destructive power of laughter is caused by the comic nature of parody with its critical sense.

If contemporary novelists are required to prove that they are able to overcome the postmoderrn downsizing of parody, Inoue's novel is a suggestive model of fiction which embraces both the comic spirit and intertexuality in parody. *Kirikirijin* suggests us that a society which loses the original sense of parody becomes spiritless.

"SMALL IS BEAUTIFUL"

According to Umberto Eco (1984), the carnivalesque can exist only in "a laboratory situation" such as in literature, stage and screen. It must be limited to the field of fiction because, if it happens in reality, it becomes an event realised as a revolution, producing "a restoration of their own revolutionary rules (another *contradiction in adjecto*) in order to install their new social model" (6). To avoid such an imminent contradiction, the carnivalesque must be confined to the imaginary world. The aim of carnival, with its sarcastic and comic sense, is not to carry out real transgressions but to remind us of the existence of rules (Eco 6). The anti-hierarchical nature of the carnival is effective when it attacks social norms and regulations. Eco describes the power of carnival as "a true movement of freedom"; yet, he considers that its inherent power must spark "only for a moment", which then becomes "the truth" (8). In this respect, the power of carnival is best valued in a *temporal* action, though which we see the possibility of liberation.

Inoue's novel is a good model of Eco's definition of carnival. The Kirikirians' search for freedom from the law is *temporally*, as they win their independence from the State of Japan only for the period of a forty-hour revolution. The "true movement of freedom" that the villagers initiate is the project of creating an egalitarian, agrarian utopia based on the idea that "small is beautiful". The idea has been defined by the British economist E. F Schumacher (1911-1977) in his *Small is Beautiful* (1973), which has been hailed as one of the most important books on ecology in the twentieth century.[1] Schumacher's book is now labelled as one of the most important books of "ecotopia", those utopian texts dealing with environmental issues (Kumar 406).[2] The significance of this book lies in the fact that he ascribes the cause of the ecological crisis to both the excessive consumption of natural capital and the

---

[1] Nancy Jack Todd in her introduction to *People, Land, and Community* (1997) refers to the impact of *Small is Beautiful* as follows: "According to *The London Times Literary Supplement* of October 6, 1995, Schumacher's *Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered* ranks among the hundred most influential books published since World War II. The selection was made by a group of writers and scholars hoping to create 'a common market of the mind' to bridge the cultural divisions of postwar Europe. ... Since its publication in 1973, it has been translated into approximately twenty languages" (1-2).

[2] Also, Thomas Docherty in *Postmodernism: A Reader* (1999) writes that the year 1968 witnessed a growing concern about ecology (4).

oversized mechanisation of agriculture in developed countries. In conclusion, he reaches to the view that "small is beautiful", considering it to be the key concept to understand how to protect the world from emerging ecological crisis.

Schumacher's critical approach towards today's environmental crisis mostly derives from his reflection upon the traditional notion of the relationship between humankind and nature. The economist starts by exposing the danger of an excessive search for power and profit. He criticises the "profligate" expenditure of natural capital, such as coal and oil, upon which industries are built, and denounces the position of energetic dependence on oil from the Middle East. Schumacher writes: "The political implications of this fact are too obvious to require discussion" (qtd. in Todd 4-5); certainly, his statement is still relevant in the twenty-first century.[3] A solution is, according to Schumacher, to avoid the "violent" way the West has developed itself economically. Based on his own experiences of living in Burma and Thailand, he condemns the Western model of economic development. After studying the Buddhist and Taoist religions, along with Mahatma Gandhi's concept of "non-violent" action, he becomes doubtful of the long-held idea that the Western approach is universally valid, namely the fact that economical development necessarily implies urbanisation, industrialisation, centralisation, efficiency, quantity, and speed. In this respect, Schumacher laments that non-developed countries tend to follow Western recipes: "[The] educated elite in developing countries, usually trained in Europe or America, tends to have been brainwashed into the same uncritical enthusiasm for technical sophistication which produces so much idiocy in the West" (qtd. in Davy xiv). He is aware that, if Western tools are too complex, traditional tools in developing countries are too primitive. Thus, he seeks an "intermediate technology", i.e. a neutral way between the advanced countries and the developing ones. As such, he encourages small-scale farms and craft industry. The intermediate technology is designed to "combine traditional and advanced knowledge for creating new

---

[3] On this point, Nancy Jack Todd (1997) states: "Adamantly opposed to excessive material consumption, meaningless growth, corporate domination, and world-scale economic systems, Schumacher would have been gratified to see how his ideas, steadily gaining momentum over the years, have created a significant undertow to counter the 1990s global dynamic dominated by GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade". (2)

technologies to address questions of impact and scale" (Todd 5). Schumacher searches for a way to fill in the gap between these two ways of thinking, namely "a middle way between materialist heedlessness and traditionalist immobility", so that this third way can challenge the world's growing problems.

Given that the Western way is by no means universally acceptable, Schumacher stresses the necessity of the inter-exchange of cultural and social knowledge as the way to solve an emerging environmental crisis. To him, the evolution of measures must have an impact on the evolution of our minds, insofar as "all important realities are measurable" (qtd. in Davy xii). In a broader sense, Schumacher's approach corresponds to the negation of "grand" ideas of Western philosophy. This sets the scene for the theoretical viewpoint of postmodernism: he is against all traditional philosophy defined as "an attempt to create an orderly system of ideas by which to live and to interpret the world" (*Small is Beautiful* 75-6). In other words, the claim for universality brings about "the great dangers of our time" in light of the future of ecology, politics and economics. Tacit assumptions proclaimed by "universal laws" have been so convincingly defended by philosophers and theoreticians that no alternative ideas seem to have emerged. Schumacher condemns the self-sufficient cultures of the West and their demoralising impacts on the economic development of the world. He aims to offer an alternative perspective based on the renewable resources of forestry and agriculture. Those societies and communities which embark upon renewable resources hold the sign of longer life. As Schumacher writes:

> It makes sense that nature is an unbelievably complicated, self-balancing system in which the unconsidered use of partial knowledge can do more harm than good. As far as I can see, chemical agriculture has over-reached itself. It is working against nature instead of with her. (qtd. in Todd 3-4)

Thus, technology cannot achieve anything without the nourishment of human and social development. John Davy (1982) states that "Schumacher [is] convinced that we are witnessing the end of a way of life that will destroy itself by its own contradictions within half a century" (xiv).

Schumacher's criticism of developed countries in the West is applicable to Japan. The history of Japan after World War II presents itself as a good example of "violent" economic development. After the complete defeat, it seemed obvious to construct a new nation through the progress of science, industry, and economy. Thus, Japan in the 1960s was a prosperous country with optimistic expectations. The period is dubbed as the "income doubling decade", in which the cabinet emphasises industrial over rural development, with the aim of raising Japan's economic standard. Rhetoric such as "efficiency", which Schumacher characterises as being typical of a "violent" economy, was used in Japan during that period. David Apter and Nagayo Sawa (1984) point out that the government regarded the "income doubling" program as "a forward-looking program of general economic and social improvement", which was seen as "a way of putting firmly behind her the legacy of defeat in the war and the long years of poverty and reconstruction in the aftermath" (5). Then the government aimed to reduce the "inefficient" sectors of the economy, so that labour forces, such as the farmers in small villages, would be used by the industries. These "inefficient" farmers, including the farmers of the Tohoku area (which Inoue portrays as the region of the Kirikirians), were forced to forfeit their traditional occupations. This caused severe economic poverty in their life; indeed, the average monthly income of a Tohoku village in the 1960s was 7,500 yen, whereas nationally it was 16,000 yen (Bailey 72).[4] Moreover, the so-called kerosene revolution caused people in Japan to switch from coal to fuel for heating and cooking, which lead the small villages of the Tohoku region (as the area of coal deposits) not to be providers of natural resource anymore, and advanced the economic decline in the region (Bailey 66).

Then Japan in the 1970s faced ecological problems. The Middle East War broke out in 1973, and caused great damage to Japan whose oil dependence was almost total. The so-called "oil shock" led many citizens to start challenging the concept of growth at any price. They became more aware of the environment and the pollution as a result of the country's industrialisation. Thus, Premier Tanaka's ill-

---

[4] See Bailey (122).

fated "Plan to Remodel the Japanese Archipelago" ("*Nihon retto kaizo-ron*") was perceived as the symbol of all that was bad about economic growth and big government (Bailey 83). Inoue's description of an agrarian utopia should be read in these historical contexts. Susan Napier (1996) writes:

> [The] anti-technological stance and the concomitant concern for the environment expressed in both Oe's and Inoue's work are also common to contemporary Western Utopian writers. In the case of Japan, however, this message may have more urgency than elsewhere, because of the small size of Japan and the breadth of environmental disruption that has already occurred there. (167)

Kirikirijin conveys a sense of urgency in the fight against ecological destruction. The project of creating an agrarian lifestyle challenges the "violent" nature of conventional economic policies.

Following the conventional form of utopian narrative (in which the narrative is mainly recorded through the viewpoint of main character, who is a visitor and a newcomer to the place), the social system, custom and habits of Kirikiri are introduced to readers through Furuhashi's view-point. The protagonist's little knowledge of the village helps the reader understand how the social conditions in big cities differ from the ones in small villages like Kirikiri. The downsized utopia in Inoue's text mirrors his social criticism which reveals problems relative to the urban life. Thus, what Furuhashi and his editor Sato witness with a surprise infers serious social problems inherent to such a small village in Japan. For example, two men wonder why a boy, who is too young, works as a policeman (113). Then we learn that, apart from a small number of professional jobs such as medical doctors and school teachers, most of the social functions are carried out by the elderly, women and children. The old people engage in politics, both young and old women work for social welfare and health services, and children work for the army and the media. This situation is connected to the depopulation of young men in the village, which is caused by the industrialisation and urbanisation of post-war Japan. Indeed, better wages in the urban areas attract the young workers. Jackson Bailey (1991) argues that the outflow of "able-bodied" young workers from the remote village to the urban

area is unstoppable until the local economy develops sufficiently; in other words, the pull of big city is too strong for them to resist (150).[5]

Although a sense of hopelessness and futility are often typical in remote villages in Japan, the atmosphere of Kirikiri in the novel is far from being depressed. The Kirikirians deny the archetype of village poverty and prove the richness of the natural capital and that of human power. Furuhashi, the visitor from Tokyo, is impressed by the high quality of the soil. He compares with the slackness of farmers in Tokyo, who become rich only because of the growth of property prices (*Kirikirijin* 38-40). In the face of the rich soil of Kirikiri, the protagonist fears that these farmers in Tokyo will be never concerned about increasing the percentage of food supplies per head in Japan (40). He is also impressed by the high standard of the Kirikirians' educational program. They are critical of Japanese educational system with an obedient learning over an inquiring mind (248). As such, Inoue's descriptions are satirical in order to highlight what Japanese society lacks. The comparison between life in Kirikiri and that in big cities in Japan reflects the author's concern about the ethical and spiritual degradation of contemporary Japan.[6]

In this small utopia, a variety of practical and efficient programs is embarked on by "powerless" people (such as the elderly, children and women). The Kirikirians drive a special car called the "*kokkai gijido-sha*" (the "Diet-building car") (*Kirikirijin* 261, 761-2), which is the official car of the Assembly, called Diet. The car deals with all the political and administrative functions, such as justice, finance, industry,

---

[5] This social phenomenon of depopulation in a village is termed "*dekasegi*" in Japan. For a detailed study of this social problem, see Bailey (146-50).

[6] The novel also reminds us that the author is aware of the major Western utopian writers such as Thomas More. Inoue's illustration of the monetary system in *Kirikirijin* recalls More's satirical depiction. The monetary system in Kirikiri is different from the one in Japan. First, Kirikiri is a tax-haven country that attracts big international corporations to trade with them (371-3). Second, the village holds a huge amount of gold, and a lump of gold can be casually exchanged for paper currency, despite the fact that the Kirikiri paper currency is extremely poor-looking. They deliberately make such a poor-looking paper currency for the 'practical' reason that few robbers and makers of counterfeit money will be interested in Kirikiri's money (302). In contrast to Furuhashi and Sato, who are besotted with gold, the Kirikirians treat gold casually by using it, for instance, as a stool. Such an attitude towards gold in *Kirikirijin* can be compared with More's *Utopia*, whose novelty lies in the depiction of a community in which money and private property are extinct. In a similar way to More's, Inoue's characters mock human folly about money. In addition, Date (1988) argues that Kirikiri's labour system refers to the labour program designed by Robert Owen in the nineteenth century (268-9).

education, and foreign affairs. As there is no necessity to use petrol for driving in this small community, they use coal for ecological reasons (108, 258).[7] More importantly, the "*kokkai gijido-sha*" is the symbol of the Kirikirian's egalitarianism. The main members of the Diet, whose official name is "Kirikiri Idiot's Diet", are more or less physically handicapped. They are perfectly matched to work for the Diet, because their individual problems strengthen their sensitivity for the weak and the poor (270). Susan Napier (1996) writes: "The bus thus becomes the quite essential symbol of an inverted society where outcasts are empowered and where there is no established [centre]" (162). The driver of the "*kokkai gijido-sha*" is actually the president of Kirikiri, who disguises himself as a driver to deceive a potential murderer. The camouflage is also helpful to having a direct communication with the ordinary citizens (267). As the passengers do not know the driver's identity, they have no hesitation in expressing their opinions about Kirikiri's government. Furthermore, based on their belief in human rights and mainly in human equality, the accused has the right of defending himself in the juridical system (277).

The significance of this small egalitarian and agrarian utopia is best illustrated by their form of agriculture. Kirikiri's program of agriculture is very similar to the agricultural plans designed by Schumacher in his *Small is Beautiful*. Napier argues that the agrarian nature of Kirikiri marks the arrival of "the most effective utopia" in contemporary utopian literature (164). In the face of growing environmental crisis, Inoue's utopian village exhibits various projects which are opposed to Japan's "violent" way. The villagers enjoy visiting national parks where they appreciate numerous flowers and plants in each season. An aquaculture is built for children's education. Dust and garbage are consumed as fuel for the power-station, thanks to which everybody in the village has plenty of free hot water. Following their "do-it-yourself" motto, the Kirikirians aim for self-sufficiency in food production. The policeman Isamu Abe proudly tells Furuhashi that the percentage for self-sufficiency is 100 percent, as opposed to 40 percent for Japan (*Kirikirijin* 37). The Kirikirians

---

[7] Inoue's creation of this ecological car clearly involves a satirisation of the resulting economic decline in a Tohoku village (like Kirikiri) after the so-called Kerosene revolution in the 1960s.

use an organic style of farming and a recycling system. Their style of agriculture is in fact the revival of the Japanese agriculture before the Meiji period. The historian Kawakatsu Heita (1997) explains that the success of Japan's traditional agriculture in the nineteenth century is due to its recycling system. While the European economic development in the nineteenth century was centred on the "productivity" of labour, the main concern in Japan was to use a natural capital, such as natural compost.[8] Kawakatsu argues that Japanese farmers from the fifteenth century transformed stock farms into fields of rice, and eventually succeeded in raising productivity through traditional methods (8). Then the Meiji government (1868-1912) gave priority to the adoption of Western way of agriculture over the traditional way, although the new system did not bring about desirable outcomes (Kawakatsu 12). Since then, Japanese farmers' history has been always typified by negative images, such as backwardness and poverty.[9] Thus, the Kirikirians' agricultural policies express their wish to return to a traditional system which favours the environment.

Self-sufficient agriculture, as demonstrated by the Kirikirians, is connected to the awareness that Japan is a small country with limited natural resources. As such, the Kirikirians find incongruous that a huge amount of natural resources and human energies are dissipated for the sake of the armed forces (339, 340-42).[10] Besides, they assume that the military results from the State's strategy in order to build up a type of "imagined community", a measure by which the State succeeds in making people subsumed into or belong to the one nation (344-49). In other words, the Kirikirans believe that a small island like Japan should disarm. Thus the main text of their constitution is Article 9 which announces demilitarisation (265). From their point of view, few Japanese understand the importance of this article and that is why they fail to grasp the intrinsic meaning of an ideal society. Kirikiri's peace policy is anti-imperialist, so that they are firmly against any power forces concerned with totalising and unifying power. They organise an association with the small nations all over the

---

[8] Kawakatsu characterises the difference between the Japanese and European style of agriculture as "industrial revolution" in Europe and "industrious revolution" in Japan.
[9] On this point, see *Kirikirijin* (7-8, 422-27).
[10] The Kirikirians also point out that the status of a self-defence force is barely assessed by Japanese citizens (339, 340-42).

world. One of the big events for this is the Kirikiri International Table Tennis World Cup; they invite the American Indians of Idaho, the founders of "The Free Independent Republic of Frestonia" in West London, the leaders of the Scottish independence movement, and others from place such as Taiwan, the Basque country, and Botswana (*Kirikirijin* 214-26, 289). Susan Napier argues that this style of international relationship is the opposite of Japan's foreign policy:

> Naturally, this "internationalisation" is of a very different kind from what the Meiji leaders might have dreamed of, or what post-war Japan's leaders are calling for today. Rather, it might be called an "alternative internationalisation", a gathering together with foreign groups who also oppose the technological authoritarianism that Westernisation and modernisation have wrought. (166)

The Kirikirians want to give hope to marginalised people by acknowledging their political existence and potential power (*Kirikirijin* 241-4, 573). Kirikiri's policy is highly problematic for the Japanese authority, because they fear that the "Kirikiri phenomenon" would have an influence all over the world (*Kirikirijin* 477-8). The Kirikirians' anti-imperialism, as well as their anti-authoritarianism, represents an ambition to decentralise and destabilise powers, mainly in the colonised and neglected places. They demonstrate the possibility to achieve independence through non-violent means.

The Kirikirians' highly advanced practicality is illustrated through their health program that emphasises "understanding and caring" rather than "curing" human beings (515, 614-6). Kirikiri's hospital attracts top-level doctors from the whole world (*Kirikirijin* 305). The number of beds is 1650 for a population of almost 4000. All citizens can undertake a check-up every six months and the elderly people receive free care (501-4). The hospital has more than 100 international staff with as many as 100 specialities in medicine (818). The Kirikirians are confident that their outstanding medical level, depicted as far superior as Japan's, is the best model for the future of science and medicine (505, 550, 560-2). This implies Inoue's social criticism of Japan's inefficient health system, especially for the aging society. The

novel's strong concern with the health care and human body shows how *Kirikirijin* can be a good model for a contemporary utopia. As Ernst Bloch and Theodor Adorno have argued (1968), one of the most crucial issues of utopian literature is about life, the human body and mortality. In this sense, *Kirikirijin* faces this issue seriously, exploring concrete measures.

In a broader sense, what the Kirikirians demonstrate through the motto "small is beautiful" is their appreciation of everyday life. Observing this small egalitarian, agrarian community, Furuhashi realises that the main reason for their independence should be understood in terms of their wish to preserve life itself. Their activities indicate the inseparable link between life and nature (*Kirikirijin* 249).[11] As such, the existence of community on a small scale is depicted as the first step in creating a better world; without the existence of beautiful small worlds, the global world, as the accumulation of them, will never thrive.[12] David Apter (1984), in his sociological study of the villagers' struggle in the Tohoku region, gives a suggestive view which is relevant to the ambition of the Kirikirians in Inoue's novel:

> What happened in the fields and fortresses was not mere resistance to the government's change in policy but rather a search for a new form of functionality and a call for a reappraisal by society for new forms of functionality and a call for a reappraisal of the farmers' role.... As well, the movement generated its own myths and history, building up an ideological momentum much larger in implication than the original issues. A sub-society, becoming an anti-society, defined what was being lost while seeking redemptive solutions. Yet it never become wholly separated or alienated from the larger culture. (244)

Inoue's small utopia suggests that, without consideration for small communities, we are not entitled to argue about groups on a larger scale. *Kirikirijin* exhibits the author's utopian vision for the sake of the local and the regional. To return to the local means to go back to an original way of life; Furuhashi claims that this original way of life is rooted in all Japanese people, including those living in big cities like

---

[11] Cf. Ihab Hassan's comment on the relationship between the Japanese people and nature (1996: 54).
[12] It must be mentioned that Japanese villagers in remote regions have actually attempted to enliven communities. A case in Tanohata village in the 1970s is minutely studied by Jackson Bailey (1991).

Tokyo, insofar as most of their ancestors were farmers (825).[13] It must be noted that, at the end of the novel, Furuhashi gives up his Tokyo life as a writer and chooses to stay in Kirikiri to have his family. Susan Napier (1996) writes: "Furuhashi becomes increasingly pleased to have broken his urban exile and to have found, in the congenial inhabitants of Kirikiri, the family that he never had possessed" (163). She argues that the protagonist's final decision illustrates Inoue's view that "home" is only attainable in this small utopia in remote region (198). While dystopian novels, as Orwell's and Burgess's, have insurmountable difficulties in finding "home" (*Heimat*) in today's world, Inoue's novel suggests that a dream of utopia as *Heimat* is achievable in the local small life, based on the indigenous values.

[13] About this historical context, see Janet Hunter (1989: 82-105).

A SMALL HISTORY VIS A VIS *THE GRAND OFFICIAL HISTORY*

Kirikirijin describes the vitality of a people in a small-scale utopia. It is a utopia for those who find values in the local and regional after having been marginalised by the mainstream history. Such a narrative witnesses the creation of new utopias in post-war Japan which "subvert the consensus reality of modern Japan on a variety of levels". While the writers of previous generations (in particular in the Meiji era) were likely to endorse the political ideology of the State, the post-war authors produce new political novels opposed to the dominant power. The Kirikirians' movement against government policies destabilise the established social structure, dissolve the national unity, and discover the way to build upon a small community for its own sake. In particular, the conflict between the Kirikirians and the Japanese government illustrates the conflict between an official history made by the State authority and a history belonging to small communities. The revolution in Kirikiri is a symbolical act, in the villagers' creation of their own history that has been neglected in the grand historical narratives.[1] In this respect, Inoue's text can be considered as the product of, as well as response to, a postmodern *Zeitgeist* which asserts that world history and national identity are not "naturally" occurring phenomena. Postmodern critics re-examine the established historical narratives as related to the power of authority on the grounds that they aim to investigate the process of making the predominant historical narrative, and consider how the formation of the historical narrative is related to the power of authority.

Making of small histories leads us to focus on our collective memories. Inoue's novel deals with individual and group memories, as opposed to Japanese people's collective memory which is described on an ironical mode. The main character, Furuhashi, is depicted as the caricature of contemporary Japanese who are incapable of remembering and looking back to the past. In fact, Inoue (1982) talks about the difficulty of using parody in Japanese culture, in which the people are apt to focus on something only for a short time (15). This typical aspect of Japanese society is similarly mentioned by Miyoshi Masao in *Off Center* (1991). The Japanese scholar,

---

[1] Cf. Maeda Ai (1990: 371).

working in the US, severely criticises Japanese's ability to forget the past by associating it with its capitalist consumer culture. Even postmodernism is victim of this trend; Miyoshi writes: "Whether Foucault or Lyotard, Said or Jameson, such theorists and critics are quickly [Japanised], conspicuously consumed, briefly chatted about, and usually forgotten at once without affecting even slightly the shape and direction of Japanese intellectual discourse" (25). Thus, Inoue's Furuhashi claims that forgetting makes you happier than remembering; the portrayal of such a forgetful character constitutes a direct criticism against Japanese mentality towards history, as implied in the formation of the language or in the colonial ambition of the twentieth century. In this respect, only collective memory, as the product of an official history, is able to survive at the expense of small histories. This raises the question of to what extent Japan is an "imagined community", and the notion of community becomes more arguable when the novel uncovers the multiple and antagonistic factors which were submerged in the process of constructing the nation.

As was discussed in the previous section, parody plays an important role in Inoue's fiction, which pertains to the novel's concern about collective memory and the construction of history. Insofar as parody basically requires three factors—a prior text, imitation and transformation—it is based on the premise that both the author and the reader share the knowledge of the prior-text. In *Kirikirijin*, one of the important pre-texts is the term, "*ikki*". The term refers to a revolt of peasants under oppression in Japanese history, especially in the eras before the Meiji period. The Kirikirians' rebellion is regarded as the "biggest *ikki*" ever to have occurred in this region (833). This presumes readers' historical knowledge of *ikki*; thus, peasants started an *ikki*, meaning that the Kirikiri revolution must be considered as a social movement with specific implications of a revolt or lower-class farmers. Those peasants of lower social status formed an *ikki* to defend against the exploitation from the gentry and the religious houses who were their landlords. Some of the biggest *ikki* were seen in Yamashiro (1485-1492) and Kaga from the end of the fifteenth century. In Kaga, peasants and *kokujin* (landed gentry) co-operated under the influence of the local Buddhist sect, *Jodo Shinshu*, and achieved autonomy and grew

in power, until Oda Nobunaga defeated them in 1580. The submission of Kaga's residents marked the restoration of a central authority. Thus, between the sixteenth century and the end of the Edo period (which lasted until the end of nineteenth century), Japan is characterised by the consolidation of central power. The formation of grand historical narratives has played a significant role to prevent farmers' revolts. The official historical records deliberately illustrated them as "traitors" and "barbarians". Such rhetoric in turn highlighted the power and heroism of the central power, i.e. the Tokugawa; and this latter was successful in influencing the religious house not to take part in the *ikki*. Subsequently, the *ikki* started being denounced in the general consciousness as a disgraceful event and an immoral action (Kawahara 312).

However, the *ikki* reappeared just before the reformation of the Meiji State (1868-1912). The farmers of Edo (today's Tokyo) presented a twelve-item slogan with the aim of constructing a sort of utopian community. According to the historian Tanaka Akira (1991), these demonstrators wished for an ideal community, in which all the inhabitants had a peaceful life under "naturally good politics" (488). Tanaka argues that this *ikki* was aimed to destroy the top-down structure of Japanese society and to transform it into an egalitarian society. Their ceaseless efforts became the vital force behind the political principles of the Meiji restoration, which manifested the ideas of rights and liberty and transcended the old feudal system. Despite the slogan for an egalitarian society, the Meiji government was barely different from the previous one. The new government embarked on a project of making a grand official history in order to consolidate its control over the whole country. By emphasising the divinity of the emperor defined "not simply as the embodiment of the moral order, but also as a lineal descendent of the Sun Goddess", the government convinced its citizens to worship the emperor and aimed to establish the homogenised nation (qtd. in Blocker 123).[2] This naïve belief lasted until the end of the Second World War.

In the Meiji period, we see how the nation becomes what Benedict Anderson

---

[2] For the formation of the concept of history during the Meiji period, see Miyachi and Janesen (223-4) and Tanaka (488).

terms "an imagined political community". The collective identity is made uniform through historical records; thus, "the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (Anderson 6).[3] Also national identity and the sense of communality are strengthened with a mass education system through which the state authority inculcates national devotion and a homogeneous culture. The process of making a grand, official history aims to exclude the Others, whatever they are, for the sake of a totalised and unified nation.[4]

J. Bodnar examines the conflict between grand history and small histories in the American society (1992). He writes:

> The essential contest that shaped commemoration and the interpretation of the past and present has been waged between the advocates of [centralised] power and those who were unwilling to completely relinquish the autonomy of their small worlds. Cultural leaders, usually grounded in institutional and professional structures, envisioned a nation of dutiful and united citizens that could help them attain these goals and never tired of using commemorations to restate what they thought the social order and citizen behaviour should be.... Defenders of vernacular cultures, however, had misgivings about [centralised] authorities and their interpretations of the past and the present. Their cultural expressions and public memory were not always grounded in the interest of large institutions but in the interests of small structures and associations that they had known, felt, or experienced directly. These attachments could change from time to time and include interests that served the needs of leaders as well. (245-6)[5]

Likewise, Inoue's *Kirikirijin* investigates how Japan as a modern state has been constructed through a controlled collective memory, which is opposed by the inhabitants of the small village. The novel's approach to history evokes Walter Benjamin's famous words: "There is no document of civilisation which is not at the same time a document of barbarism" (*Illuminations* 256). The German philosopher suggests that writing grand history is an "intellectual violence, which in the process of creating an understandable 'world', silences minority, or marginal, voices in order

---

[3] See also Marius Jansen (1969: 492).
[4] See Anthony Smith (16).
[5] See also James Wertsch's *Voices of Collective Remembering* (2002: 68).

to streamline a critical interpretation" (Barker 119). The Kirikirians' desire to be independent to counter-attack such an "intellectual" and political violence.

Accordingly, the Kirikirian's movement is portrayed as the biggest *ikki* ever occurred, insofar as the villagers' revolution is a part of the long history of the conflict between the State and those who have suffered from the oppression of the central power. The Krikirians' wish to make their own history expresses their hope to gain the value of small memories based on local and individual stories. By reviving the Japanese collective memory through the term "*ikki*", the novel brings to the fore contradictory aspects of the grand narratives of the official history during its process of exclusion of the Others. The historical record, written by the Kirikirans, questions the validity of the artificial collective memory. Thus, when the writer Furuhashi and his editor Sato interview the high-school teacher, who has presented an academic essay on a treasure hidden in the Tohoku region since the eleventh century (*Kirikirijin* Chapter 22), their inquiry shows a desire to discover an aspect of local history from a rural area. Furuhashi is sensitive to the life-style of the villagers, unlike his Tokyo-born editor Sato (*Kirikirijin* 35). For instance, he notices that the Kirikirians conserve the conventional calendar.[6] Indeed, the Gregorian calendar symbolises Japan's modernisation which is controlled by the central authority. Likewise, he comes to appreciate the traditional customs and habits which have been left behind in the process of Japan's economic development since the Meiji restoration. Furuhashi's look at the life in Kirikiri raises a question as to what the Japanese are and what makes Japan as it is.

As well, the process towards a unified Japan involves a language scheme.[7] In opposition to the established standard language, the villagers make a *Kirikiri Dictionary* to defend their particular language and also to inquiry into the process of the formation of dominant, official language (*Kirikirijin* 54-62). The novel claims that some residues of the Tohoku dialect are rooted in *yamato kotoba*, i.e. the original

---

[6] Japan adopted the Gregorian calendar in 1873, while retaining the traditional calendar based on imperial eras. Yet, rural habitants used a different calendar, designed for agricultural work and dividing the year into twenty-four seasons of fifteen days.
[7] Cf. Yves Chevrel (1995) in his study of comparative literature.

language of Japan used before the introduction of Chinese characters. Thus, the villagers assert with sarcasm that their language could "please" those nationalists who advocate the genuineness of the Japanese (68, 72).[8] The Kirikirians appreciate their own language, maintaining the original, traditional sounds of Japanese (75); and in doing so, the Kirikirians question the legitimacy of the standard, official Japanese. Paul Connerton in *How Societies Remember* (1989) argues that "our experience of the present largely depends upon our knowledge of the past, and...our image of the past commonly serves to legitimate a present social order" (3). Understood in this way, our experience of using the official language is up to our knowledge of the past. Inoue's novel implies that the use of the standard Japanese corresponds to a *lack* of knowledge about Japan's history, which is much more various and complex than what the official history pretends. Thus, the use of a particular language (or dialect) commits people in their beliefs that their small histories are different from grand history. The villagers' *Dictionary* is the historical account that the standard language is then accused to be "artificial" and created by the institution, while the dialect derives from the nature and customs of a vernacular place (61).[9]

The history of language in Japan is identified with the history of exclusion. A part of Inoue's novel is devoted to the historical account of the term "*ezo*" in relation to political ideologies. Generally, "*ezo*" represents barbarians, called the Ainu, and the term "*ezochi*" is their region. In the late Heian times (twelfth century), this remote region thrived in cultural terms, but it was still regarded as remote and mysterious. When the region was used as a political refuge, the image of the region as remote and dark was confirmed (Bailey 37, 43). While the Ainu were pushed northward, mainstream Japanese culture became dominant. Since then, the word *ezochi* has carried overtones of contempt in referring the Tohoku area. Inoue's novel describes how the term involves a process of marginalisation in the formation of grand historical narratives. It claims that *ezo* originally points to an eastern region and that Tokyo is thus regarded as *ezo* when the national government is located in

---

[8] On Japanese Nationalism, see Blocker (123).
[9] See also *Kirkirijin* (Chapter 23).

Kyoto. Then the Tokugawa transfers the capital to Edo (today's Tokyo), and it is the Tohoku area, at the East of Edo, that is called *ezo*. This prejudice still remains in contemporary Japanese society. The history of this term paralleled to the making of grand history, and the prejudice implied in the term is consolidated during Japan's transformation into an industrialised modern society.

As a result of its modernisation, Japan becomes officially devoid of small local histories. A village like Kirikiri is forced to give up its own history. Jackson Bailey (1991), in a study of the Tohoku villages, shows how the government's policy since the Meiji period has diminished the villagers' "small" histories. In paritular, the law for the "Integration of Towns and Villages" merges small villages and towns into a common unit. The harshness of life in small villages prevents people from keeping a record of their local history, and the central authority takes advantage of this in order to develop its own historical facts through "an artificial creation" (Bailey 8-9). Admiration for Japan's rural scenery and everyday life there, as seen in the books written by non-Japanese writers, such as Rutherford Alcock's *The Capital of the Tycoon* (1863) and Isabella Bird's *Unbeaten Tracks in Japan* (1880), have been barely discovered in the Japanese by themselves. The Japanese government since the Meiji era has mainly paid attention to the shaping of a rational, effective structure for local governments at the expense of the small vernacular histories. The central authority's discrimination against the rural places continues even after the second World War, when the villages are largely relegated to "*hekichi*", i.e. "out-of-the-way places", under a law passed by the Diet in 1949. In 1953, the national government promulgated another law which meant to streamline local government, and this policy is still in place up to today.[10]

Unveiling the historical contexts in such "out-of-the-way places" implies remembering the "essential truth" of the past (Wertsch 42), and thus Inoue's characters struggle to make a record of their hardships. The Kirikirians' historical narrative is "true" in the sense that the emotions involved in their collective memory

---

[10] According to the *Mainichi* newspaper (3 October, 2004), the current number of the towns and villages is three thousand and thirty. The State plans to reduce their numbers to two thousand and fifty-five by April 2005.

are shared by the people living in the same location and also by those who have a similar experience. Inoue's novel suggests that the fictional characters embody people's voices, which have been neglected since the construction of grand narratives. In the opening chapter, we are told that the Kirikirians' coup d'état could have happened in any place and time in history, such as during the eighth century when the emperor exploited massive amounts of gold from northern Japan in order to build the biggest Buddhist sculpture, or during the end of the nineteenth century when the Japanese government introduced Western agriculture and destroyed the traditional lives of the farmers. The cause of their revolution could have also been related to the new agricultural policy of the 1970s, which adopted the American style of mechanisation (*Kirikirijin* 7-8, 422-27). Ultimately, the percentage of farmers in Japan shifted from 45% to 5.4% between 1945 and 1984 (Bailey 146). There is little mention of the farmers' suffering in official historical records; in this sense, the Kirikirians express the hope that some may tell the long-held "truth" of the villagers' (mainly farmers') life.

Inoue's historical concern is resonant with the postmodernist investigation on the formation of historical discourses.[11] A history without the memory of the Others does not appreciate the difference and is potentially totalitarian. Postmodernists encourage a social praxis which values the complexities of personal, cultural, ethical, and national identities. The representation of marginalised voices shows that the historical construction of the State depends on the Others' small histories.

The Kirikirians' ambition to challenge grand history is also similar to dystopian writers' aim to criticise uniform and totalised societies. Their main characters destabilise the established society by expressing themselves through marginalised styles of language. These dystopian protagonists with unorthodox languages, such as *Nineteen Eighty-Four*'s Winston Smith and *A Clockwork Orange*'s Alex, challenge the reader's collective memory and history. According to David Sisk (1997), language in dystopia is a refutation of utopia's escape *from* history. Utopia's perfect society does not require history since perfection does not

---

[11] Cf. Chatper III of this thesis.

allow changes, contingency, conflict, and uncertainty. Dystopia negates utopia's ahistorical nature, meaning that humankind must learn history in order to avoid the mistakes from the past. In the words of George Santayan, dystopia conveys the idea that "those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it" (qtd. in Sisk 11). Language in dystopian literature questions the present status quo and illustrates the conflict between the individual and the state order. Inoue's use of language carries out the same function, although Kirikiri is not a dystopian, nightmarish place. Inoue echoes the same purpose as dystopian writers' in the sense that he deconstructs the mythical concept that Japan is a unified country.[12] The novel's fictional characters demonstrate the capability of ordinary people, who reject the totalitarian nature of grand history and the State formed by it.

However, the Kirikirians' interest in history may be problematic, unless we apply some limitations to it. David Apter's (1984) comment on a protest organised by a group of Japanese citizens ("sanrizuka movement") implies the crucial problem inherent to any revolutionary activity by the public. Although Apter seems not to be aware, the following comment suggests how easily and even extravagantly a social movement by the public can be mythicised:

> Sanrizuka became the symbol of extra-institutional protest in Japan, a metaphor of government oppression, and a sign of the state itself. As the struggle evolved, the movement became *heroic*, *epic*, and remarkable both in its own eyes and within a wider circle of supporters. (10-11 emphasis added)

Indeed, the danger is that the villagers' excessive interest for history may embrace a "fascist" nature; the wish to possess a collective memory may fail to acknowledge the complexity and ambiguities of history itself.[13] As such, their accounts may end

---

[12] On this point, Napier's following discussion is suggestive: "What is perhaps unusual about this emphasis is that it should be Japan, a notably homogeneous country, which hosts writers who so consistently [emphasise] the marginal. This in itself may be a reaction against the very homogeneity that politicians such as former Prime Minister Nakasone are wont to celebrate. It also may be an implicit admission of Japan's own peculiar status in the contemporary world, a modern nation that is ultimately neither East nor West" (166).

[13] On this view, see also Hans Bertens (1995: 99-100). Also, Ursula Heise (1997) argues that postmodern consciousness "allows one to reflect on the possibility of different and perhaps alternative histories to frame the present, which themselves have to be evaluated with critical distance" (74).

up becoming "ahistorical" if constructed from only one single perspective.[14] In this respect, the Kirikirians' attempt to create their own history should not negate the Others' own histories, which would contradict the egalitarian principle of the Kirikiri nation.

How then should we evaluate the forty-hour-long revolution of the Kirikirians? It must be acknowledged that the Kirikirians' unachieved revolution does not mean their final subordination. Their movement should be deemed as a part of endless struggles of the minorities in opposition to any forms of power threatening cultural, regional and human diversity. The motivation underlying the whole novel is centred on the novel's impact on the readers. The first sentence of the text suggests that the author welcomes the readers' various reactions to the text:

> The incident can be taken as incomprehensible, serious, incredibly funny, simple and sincere, full of implications, upsetting for the politicians and their followers, attractive to media which always looks for big topics, exciting for the ordinary citizens, bringing about a neurosis to lawyers and linguists. (*Kirikirijin* 1)

This sentence shows that the main topic is not about the success or failure of the farmers' independent movement. The past tense used in the narrative implies that the main concern of the novel is not only about the possibility and plausibility of the villagers' independent movement. It also aims to convey that the Kirikiri revolution is over and is a past event. The author is aware that the plausibility of sustaining a country like Kirikiri can be undermined by an increase in population because there will be an independent movement *within* Kirikiri itself. Inoue says in an interview, "Kirikiri could not have continued without losing the very momentum and dynamism on which it was based, thereby necessitating another Kirikiri independence movement and then another and another" (qtd. in Napier 164). His aim is to convey the idea that a society is always in need of a recurrent revolution, such that the cycle does not end but repeats itself endlessly.[15]

Therefore, the forty-hour revolution tells us how a minority can form an

---

[14] Cf. Wertsch (41-2).
[15] See also Robert Nozick's argument in his *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (1974: 299).

influential socio-political movement. The significance of the Kirikiri revolution can be drawn by referring to the arguments presented by the French philosopher, Gilles Deleuze (1990), who asks, "How can minority be powerful? How can resistance become an insurrection? How can we conceive a community that has real force but no base, that isn't a totality but is, as in Spinoza, absolute?" To these questions, his answer is:

> The difference between minorities and majorities isn't their size. A minority may be bigger than a majority. What defines the majority is a model you have to conform to.... A minority, on the other hand, has no model, it's a becoming, a process. One might say the majority is nobody. Everybody's caught, one way or another, in a minority becoming that would lead them into unknown paths if they opted to follow it through. When a minority creates models for itself, it's because it wants to become a majority, and probably has to, to survive or prosper (to have a state, be [recognised], establish its rights, for example). (*Negotiations* 173)

Deleuze praises the momentous power of minorities. To him, the successful result does not matter, since the existence of a minority is sufficient by itself to highlight a revolutionary motivation defined as "a real rebellious spontaneity" (176). Inoue highlights this "real rebellious spontaneity" by showing how the villagers challenge the established forms of knowledge and power.

To conclude, *Kirikirijin* describes a small utopia, meaning that Inoue's novel demonstrates the possibility of exploring utopia through a new form. In this sense, *Kirikirijin* is nostalgic about what Japan lost. [16] The novel ends on a failure, when the president-designate Furuhashi (who is eventually assigned to be the president of this community) is assassinated. Yet, the central theme of the novel is to highlight an optimistic view of the world and a hope for a new society in Japan. Therefore, a small downsized utopia is suggested as a possible dream, but it is a process in everlasting becoming and not an end in itself.

---

[16] For example, Napier states: "The title of his [Inoue's] hero Furuhashi's only successful book refers not only to the protagonist's lost memory but to the lost memory of the Japanese people...." (168).

Chapter VI
Murakami Haruki's
Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World
Utopia in the Age of Late Capitalism

This thesis will conclude with a discussion of Murakami Haruki's *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* (1985). The novel is comprised of two apparently unrelated stories: "Hard-boiled Wonderland" and "The End of the World". The two narratives are deployed one after another, and it emerges in the middle of the novel that the world described in the latter narrative is a vision taking place in the protagonist's consciousness. In this novel, a utopian community is presented "The End of the World", therefore, in the protagonist's mind.

The central concern of this chapter is to explore utopia in the age of late capitalism. Murakami's novel offers a new approach, and constitutes a significant response to Krishan Kumar's pessimistic view that utopian literature is decayed and has lost its original strength. This chapter starts by examining the growing popularity of Murakami's work in the world, and aims to consider the reason for such a success. One of the principle thematic concerns in Murakami's novel is the individual's "ordinary" life. Utopia is pictured within the "ordinary" man who simply enjoys his life, preferring to be detached from any social events. This chapter will then move on to examine the contents of this utopia, and will pay special attention to the protagonist's evaluation of the self-made utopia itself. Finally, there will be an analysis of Murakami's depiction of this "ordinary" character being involved in mysterious incidents; we see a change in the protagonist's social and political consciousness. In consequence, Murakami's novel infers that profound self-reflection is the path to the construction of a better world.

THE "MURAKAMI HARUKI PHENOMENON"

Murakami Haruki (1949-) is one of the most well-known Japanese novelists. The growing interest in his literary work from overseas is seen by the increasing number

of articles about his work in newspapers and magazines.[1] Moreover, Murakami's novels are translated into more than thirty languages, and introduced to various countries such as Germany, the Philippines, Thailand, India, and Mexico. In China, more than one million and five hundred thousand copies have been published in the last decade.[2] These figures from across the world prove the wide popularity of Murakami's novels.

The popularity of Murakami's novels outside Japan defines him as a "global" writer.[3] This then leads us to the assumption that the worldwide "Murakami phenomenon" proves that utopian literature is still capable of having a "universal" appeal to humankind. To be a "global" writer means to be, in Dick Hebdige's words, "more or less cosmopolitan". Such scholars, as Harumi Befu (2001), consider the phenomenon of globalisation from a postcolonial point of view, holding that "there is only one centre of globalisation and that this centre is the West" (3-4).[4] However, globalisation should not only be examined in terms of a geographical starting-point; rather it should be through of as a world-level phenomenon, which may flow from a distant corner of the earth to another one, so that the source of artistic and cultural products and information becomes less significant when they are shared and appreciated by people across the world. In other words, the phenomenon called "globalisation" creates a borderless, rootless image of oneself. The decentralisation of Western thought and culture towards small histories and marginalised societies is

---

[1] The number of articles about his work in newspapers and magazines has increased by almost four times during the past twenty years. While there were almost 96 articles between 1995 to 1999, the number of articles about his novels was 510 from 1998 to 2003. The source of this information is http://www.dialognewsroom.com.

[2] Cf. Yuri Schiko (2003).

[3] According to Harumi Behu (2001), the term "globalisation" has replaced the word "internationalisation" in the 1970s. While "internationalisation" generally means a relationship between two nations, "globalisation" is "simultaneous extension and expansion in all directions" (Befu 3). Japan's position in the world parallels this shift, since Japan extended its economical interests all over the world from the 1970s to the 1980s. In this context Murakami's fiction can be interpreted as cultural diffusion, one of what Befu calls the fourfold framework of the concept of globalisation (Befu 4).

[4] Befu's idea of "globalisation" centres on the extension and expansion of interests and influences. She criticises the work of scholars such as Arjun Appadurai (1996), Peter Beyer (1994), Roland Robertson (1992) and Malcom Waters (1995), on the grounds that their studies convey the Western-centred point of view. In her book on globalisation, she attempts to demonstrate the possibility of "multiple globalisations" by showing how Japan's soft-power makes a significant contribution to cultural and social interests and influences across the world.

associated with postmodern sensibility. Thus, a "global" writer is often interpreted as a synonym for a "postmodern" writer. Murakami is no exception; for instance, the back cover of the English paperback edition of *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* (trans. 1991) cites a comment from the *Los Angeles Times Magazine*:

> He has become the foremost representative of a new style of Japanese writing; hip, cynical, highly [stylised], set at the juncture of cyberpunk, postmodernism, and hard-boiled detective fiction.... Murakami [is] adept at deadpan wit, outrageous style.

A writer in the *Los Angeles Magazine* (April 2001) finds a similarity between Murakami's style and contemporary writers'; and concludes: "[He's] one of the masters of what I'd call Metaphysical Pulp—a smart, dreamlike, postmodern style practised by novelists as diverse as Paul Auster, Stanislaw Lem, Don Delillo, J.G. Ballard, and this magazine's own Steve Erickson". Furthermore, many of the academic essays also focus on the "postmodern" features of Murakami's fiction.[5]

It is certain that Murakami's work has an affinity with the postmodern sensibility. To begin with, the structure of *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* can be described as postmodern. As in Alasdair Gray's *Lanark*, the novel is discontinuous and departs from the conventional narrative structure of linear narrative movement. Secondly, Murakami's novel represents a fragmented self, something which is typical of postmodern novels. Written in the first person, the story of "Hard-boiled Wonderland" is narrated through the use of "watashi" (i.e. the formal pronoun 'I' in Japanese speech), whereas the other story is narrated by "boku" (i.e. the more informal definition of 'I'). Because of these different pronouns, reader at first believes that the stories are independent of each other. Such an assumption is rejected in the middle of the novel, as it turns out that both characters are actually the same individual.[6] Thirdly, the postmodern negation of elitism can be

---

[5] Cf. Yoshio Iwamoto's "A Voice from Postmodern Japan: Haruki Murakami" (1993) and Matthew Strecher's "Beyond 'Pure' Literature: Mimesis, Formula, and the Postmodern in the Fiction of Murakami Haruki" (1998).

[6] In the English translation, the two forms of pronoun are translated as "I". Thus the author's deliberate use of different pronouns may be less effective in the English translation.

seen in Murakami's work; this anti-elitism pertains to Murakami's challenge of the literary canon in Japan. As is pointed out by critics and is also acknowledged by the author himself, Murakami's writing cannot be grouped into traditional Japanese literature, in particular into the group of *junbungaku* ("pure" literature). Yet it must be also noted that his work cannot simply be categorised as popular literature in the Western definition. As Matthew Strecher (1995) argues, such dual categories are not appropriate to Japan's specific socio-cultural context. Indeed, the distinction between 'pure' and 'mass' literature in Japan (*junbungaku* and *taishūbungaku*, respectively) does not completely match the Western distinction between 'serious' and 'popular' literature (120). Strecher goes on to write:

> Such terminology, larded with implicit value judgement, is especially cumbersome when applied to a writer like Murakami, who maintains a widespread readership, writes in a light, easygoing style, and yet is clearly not typical of the mass-production-oriented popular writers today. (120) [7]

Understood in this way, Murakami's fiction is located in a sort of grey area. Murakami himself is indifferent to this kind of argument over his position of his literary work. He claims that he only writes what he likes to write about, in defiance of the conventional rules or manners.

Murakami's anti-elitism implies that there are numerous references to popular culture in his work. In *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World*, we find the protagonist being familiar with such cultural icons as: *Key Largo*, *The Big Sleep*, John Ford's *Quiet Man*, *El Cid*, *Ben Hur*, *Spartacus*, McDonalds, Duran Duran, Duke Ellington, Bob Dylan, and so on. Popular culture in his literary world is used as a ubiquitous background in the sense that it is not used to specify a particular theme. Instead, the author employs these signs of popular culture to delineate the "mood" of

---

[7] Strecher also states: "What he...[reacts] against in *junbungaku*, the traditional *belles lettres* of Japan, is the combination of an established literary language, 'accepted styles, concern for literary society (represented by the *bundan*, or literary guild), and a tradition of grounding the realism of 'fiction' in the author's own experience" (4).

the moment. They are discursive commodities in contemporary urban life, and the character who enjoys them is the "ordinary" common man we see in our own life.[8]

Murakami's novels are also resonant with the postmodern belief that there is nothing to reveal but only surfaces to inhabit. This is particularly acute in his sense of language. Murakami's narrative is constructed through a simple, plain language, and the characters have great difficulties in expressing precisely feelings in everyday life. The protagonist in *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* often says, "I have no words for it" (59). He is unable to find a word which can perfectly convey his ideas. When complimenting the beauty of the librarian's hair, he does not express himself clearly, and the librarian replies: "I know you compliment my hair, but you also meant to signify something in your mind, don't you? I assume you unwittingly think about something else through my hair, making an allusion to it".[9] Feelings are interpreted as indefinable and ineffable in Murakami's fiction. Words do not have always clear meanings; yet, Murakami's characters never suffer from the frustration. The protagonist instead expresses his feelings through analogies: "I closed my eyes, I felt a ripple run through my mind. The wave went beyond sadness or solitude; it was a great, deep moan that resonated in my bones" (391). The search for an exact expression in words is no longer attempted; instead, exploration of words to express reality ceases on the surface. Thus, a word such as "ripple" increases the multiplicity of meaning within it, and unarticulated meanings may be discovered by each reader.

The absence of an essentialist representation means that Murakami aims to depict "a mood". Matthew Strecher (1995) writes: "Murakami's purpose, one might say, has been to evoke the feelings that arose from the events of the late 1960s and early 1970s, rather than to concern himself with those events themselves" (18-19). Depicting "a mood" rather than "events" themselves may give the impression that the author avoids any political and social commitments. Yet, this is misleading, insofar as Murakami does not hesitate to describe small events and experiences. He

---

[8] See J. Mcinerney's interview with Murakami (1992).

[9] This translation is mine. In Alfred Birnbaum's translation, the librarian's comment is: "When you speak of my hair, are you also speaking about something in you?" (64). This translation seems to be less faithful to the original text.

portrays the details of everyday life, including going to supermarkets, cooking, buying clothes and even renting videos. These small events cannot be compared to the "big" events of politics and economics; yet, this does not prove that Murakami neglects events happening at non-personal level. His picture of "a mood" is deemed to pertain to his style, which eschews any objective and systematic judgements. Things become abstract when they are connected to social and political issues. Thus, the protagonist analyses situations through fictive references; looking at some youth smoking, he remembers a scene from Godard's film: "This is where the Jean-Luc Godard scene would have been titled *Il regardait le feu de son tabac*. My luck that Godard films were no longer fashionable." (*HWEW* 132). Here again we find a reluctance to pursue something deeply, and the comfort of dwelling on the surface. The sense of objectivity is avoided, as if there were no places for a foundation, or sources for achieving ontological truths. The postmodern uncertainty regarding the possibility of a fixed meaning is seen in *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World*. The novel deals with a sense of scepticism, such that the protagonist believes that the norm in society should be measured by "convenient approximations" rather than an established objective, authoritative truth:

> For instance, supposing that the planet earth were not a sphere but a gigantic coffee table, how much difference in everyday life would that make? Granted, this is pretty far-fetched example; you can't rearrange facts of life so freely. Still, picturing the planet earth, for convenience sake, as a gigantic coffee table does in fact help clear away the clutter—those practically pointless contingencies such as gravity and the international dateline and the equator, those nagging details that arise from the spherical view. I mean, for a guy leading a perfectly ordinary existence, how many times in the course of a lifetime would the equator be a significant factor? (*HWEW* 4)

In the protagonist's view, there are "infinite possibilities" in the world, from which one can select a reasonable idea (16).[10] Living in the world with no tangible foundations, the protagonist concludes that the only way to grasp certainty is through

---

[10] The text of this part is absent from Birnbaum's translation; that is why the page number refers to the original text.

empirical means. As he says, "an accurate recount" of coins in his pocket is the only way to confirm his sense of being.

Finally, Murakami describes individuals living in a world of commodity, something typical of the postmodern consumer society. According to Fredric Jameson (1984), postmodernism *is the dominant* style which derives from the context of a late capitalist society, whose cultural phenomenon is characterised by him, negatively, as "pastiche", which stands for the "death of the subject".[11] Murakami's depiction of contemporary consumer society is, however, more complicated. Although he is critical of the Japanese society in the 1970s for the reason that the economic growth during this time deprived people of a political consciousness, he struggles to discover a positive meaning in the life of late capitalism. This tendency is seen in his illustration of the protagonist's attempt to gain a sense of fulfilment out of the multiple choices of the supermarket. The act of choice gives him the affirmation of his subjectivity and autonomy.

These postmodern features in Murakami's work are certainly important factors with which to characterise his work. However, this approach to his work also contains some problems which may undermine the value of his work itself. These problems are related to the fact that Murakami is a globally accessible author. Indeed, his postmodern sensibility could become a mere commodity, which takes place within a capitalist system. Artistic and intellectual activities are subject to homogenising and systematising forces under capitalism's global logic. For the sake of profit and competition, globalisation can be considered to be "opening-up of new markets rather than new worlds" (Bertens 91-2). What is prioritised is market opportunity and, accordingly, we see the increasing standardisation and homogenisation of societies and cultures across the world. Thus, the selection of literary works to be published now becomes to be not mainly based on mere quality

---

[11] Cf. Chapter V of this thesis.

but also on their selling-rate.[12] The incorporation of Random House and Kodansha (a leading publishing house in Japan) in 2003 is a symbolic event which stresses the crucial feature of homogeneity in global capitalism. The *Financial Times* (November 2003) notes that we should not underestimate the impact of this merger:

> The move is the first step in Random House's ambitious expansion drive into Asia, which is viewed as a growth market for the company. The US-based publisher, a unit of German media giant Bertelsmann, is set to buy a stake in a South Korean publisher by the summer. According to Random House projected revenues from Japan, South Korea and China combined are eventually expected to match its US revenues, which were roughly $600m in fiscal 2001.

This is part of a "transnational corporate's cultural domination", which explains why the capitalistic world is "a world in which 'private giant economic enterprises pursue—sometimes competitively, sometimes co-operatively—historical capitalist objectives or profit making and capital accumulation, in continuously changing market and geopolitical conditions" (Morley and Robins 13). Thus, the Chairman of Random House Asia comments: "We want to find fresh voices in Japan. I hope I can find ten Haruki Murakami in the next ten years". As such, Murakami's work is valued as an attractive commodity; and its success means that it can be "enterprised up", in Marilyn Strathern's phrase (qtd. in Lury 148, 149). We reach a sort of contradiction, insofar as postmodern stresses the notion of cultural difference; yet, postmodernism also tends to stand for being monolithic because of global capitalism. Thus, readers are "no longer addressed in political terms, that is as the citizens of a national community, but rather as economic entities, as parts of a consumer market" (Morley and Robins 11). For those who mainly focus on the success in business industries, global capitalism will promise a new "utopian" era, in which the world

---

[12] Nowadays the selling-rate is considered as a crucial condition for possible publication. Richard Ohmann claims that both sales and scholarly attentions matter. As quoted in Strecher's article: "[First], brisk sales (Ohmann argues convincingly that, contrary to the conventional wisdom, being on a best-seller list helps rather than hinders a book's critical reception); and second, the right kind of critical attention.... Ohmann goes on to observe that these two factors have little significance when considered in isolation; what is important is their *relationship*, and he stresses the impact on cannon-formation of the 'interaction between large audiences and gatekeeper intellectuals'" (35).

becomes closer through shared commodities. Yet, from another view-point, the growing power of global corporations may signal the arrival of a dystopian era in which individual choices or localities are neglected. As Fredric Jameson (1984) points out, in the "multi-national" stage of capitalism, concepts, such as art, intellect and knowledge, are transformed into "commodified signs" that can be both bought and sold. As a result, everything becomes deprived of subjectivity (46).

Consequently, global capitalism uses the notion of diversity and difference for its own sake. Julia A. Thomas's study (2001) on the reception of contemporary Japanese photography in America is suggestive on this issue; it shows how "Japaneseness" is utilised for business purposes. In the case of Murakami's novel, the strategy amounts to distancing it from its Japanese origins. The front page of *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* accentuates the "surprising" fact that Murakami overthrows the West's archetype of Japanese authors.[13] A writer in *Weekend Australian* (July 2001) shows a surprise concerning the "non-Japaneseness" of Murakami's novel and asks, "Can the Nobel Prize for Literature be awarded to a man who writes sentences that translate as 'Her resolve was a regular Rock of Gibraltar?' It's a good question and one we should attend to immediately because, if the British literati hold sway, it's going to happen soon". Likewise, *Los Angeles Magazine* (2001) highlights the anti-traditional attitude in Murakami's work, writing that his novel is "an anthem for a younger generation who felt that Japan's traditional values weren't so much wrong as irrelevant".[14] Most of the reviews and articles (including the ones in encyclopaedias) mention Murakami's upbringing, such as the fact that his parents are high school teachers of Japanese literature, from whose influence Murakami aims to escape, becoming rather inclined to Western popular culture. According to Julia Thomas, the emphasis upon "Japaneseness" is "most

---

[13] On the front page, there is a quotation from *Esquire*: "[A] mix of American fun and Japanese dread". Besides, *The Times* writes: "Off the wall…hilariously bizarre…splendid…a remarkable book…Alfred Birnbaum has captured the crazed, surreal feel of Muakami's Japanese".

[14] Another American journal, the *Baltimore Sun* (2001), states: "His domestic audience is dominated by readers who, as they came of age, began to question the busy hard mentality of their elders, even as they let themselves grow somewhat spoiled and self-absorbed in the comforts provided by all the postwar striving of their parents—the very effort that made Japan an economic superpower".

heavily upon a Japaneseness of family, birth, and upbringing" (137). The insistence on the "non-Japaneseness" of Murakami's work neglects, in fact, the author's own position. As he speaks of himself, Murakami is keenly aware of his position as a Japanese writer, and is very concerned about problems seen in Japan.[15] Despite this, his strong interest in what shapes Japan as well as the Japanese is not taken into account in the commercial promotion of his work. Undoubtedly, the strategy of business industry may become a challenge issue for Murakami as well as for other contemporary writers, making it necessary for them to avoid the danger of being used as ideal "commodities" in global capitalism.

The non-Japaneseness and postmodern nature of Murakami's fiction obviously help to make the reading easily accessible, mainly for people which are unfamiliar with Japanese cultural contexts. This is remarkable when we compare Murakami with Inoue Hisashi, whose work has been discussed in the previous chapter. Despite the fact that Inoue's popularity in Japan causes him to be dubbed "the busiest man in the world" by the American magazine *Time* (August 1983), few of his books have been actually translated and read outside Japan. While Inoue's texts need some specific knowledge of Japanese history and culture, Murakami's novels require none.[16] Murakami's characters enjoy pop culture, and eat pasta, hamburgers and vichyssoise. His novel creates a blurring borderline between the West and Japan, and gives an impression of easy accessibility, contrary to the Japanese writers of previous generations. John Fowler points out that Kawabata Yasunari's Nobel Prize for literature in 1968 had little impact on bringing his fiction to the world. On the contrary, Fowler goes on to argue, the event "may have unwittingly made Japan appear more distant in readers' eyes by reinforcing their image, nurtured by stereotypes found in prewar travel literature, of the country as exotic, impenetrable,

---

[15] Murakami states in an interview: "But you see, what I wanted was first to depict Japanese society through that aspect of it that could just as well take place in New York or San Francisco. You might call it the Japanese nature that remains only after you have thrown out, one after another, all those parts that are altogether too 'Japanese'" *(New York Times* 1993: 28).

[16] A writer in the *Weekend Australian* (July 2001) introduces Murakami's fiction to public readers by insisting on the new style of his language: "By transposing Western influences on to his native tongue to create a new language, Murakami hopes to distil something distinctly Japanese. Perhaps we are left with something more universal".

and inscrutable' (qtd. in Strecher 3). Matthew Strecher (1995) describes the emergence of Murakami's work as the turning point in the history of Japanese literature, since it demonstrates how "Japanese literature responds according to changes in the society which produces it" (11). This could explain the cause of "Murakami Haruki phenomenon". Despite the tension between cultural homogenisation and heterogenisation, the increasing popularity of Murakami's novels suggests that there is, among readers, an "internationally shared value judgement".[17] This needs to be considered in association with Julia Thomas's argument:

> The individuals in these art worlds still act creatively as "individuals" rather than as "subjects" of 'nation-states' or of "discursive formations" or even of "global capitalism". We need a theory of culture's globalisation that recognises and resonates with this same creativity. (145)

It is the individual uniqueness of Murakami's fiction that certainly attracts readers across the world. If the postmodern features already mentioned are important factors for characterising his novels, they should be deemed as signs that his literary world is based on the presupposition that we are living in postmodern cultural mood in the age of late capitalism.

A key idea running through Murakami's literary world, and the one which draws readers from around the world, is the sense of "ordinariness". Murakami presents us characters who are content with their off-centred position, and celebrate their "ordinariness". The author believes himself to be an "ordinary" man, as he states: "I am not a genius, not much talented, not so smart, not so intelligent, just an ordinary guy" (*Baltimore Sun* 2001). A sense of attachment to an ordinary character echoes throughout his novels; the protagonist in *Norwegian Wood* says: "I'm just an ordinary guy—ordinary family, ordinary education, ordinary face, ordinary grades, ordinary thoughts in my head". Happiness to be average and unexceptional corresponds to the rejection of being an authoritarian and dominative figure. To

---

[17] Cf. J. Mcinerney's article (1992).

celebrate one's "ordinariness" means to cherish one's own small yet significant secrets and the rituals of everyday life. Murakami's main claim is to affirm that ordinariness is the only way to survive contradictory situations of two extremes, i.e. extravagant diversity and dull homogeneity.

In *The Idea of Postmodern* (1995) Hens Bertens points to the fact that postmodernists are too content to acknowledge "the so-called death of subject—and thus of the author—without [realising] that the end of representation [has] paradoxically made questions of subjectivity and authorship (redefined in postmodern terms, that is, in terms of agency) all the more relevant". He goes on to argue:

> If representations do not and cannot represent the world, then inevitably all representations are political, in that they cannot help reflecting the ideological frameworks within which they arise. The end of representation thus leads us back to the question of authorship, to such political questions as "Whose history gets told? In whose name? For what purpose?" (Marshall 1992:4). In the absence of transcendent truth it matters, more than ever, who is speaking (or writing), and why, and to whom. Deconstructionist postmodernism largely ignored these and other political questions that the demise of representation had given prominence to. (7)

Similar arguments to Bertens's are explored by several scholars. Thus, Julia Thomas holds that individual creativity and the vision of artists should not simply be absorbed *into capitalism's logic of similarity or into the national logic of difference.* Likewise, Arjun Appadurai (1996) argues: "The central feature of global culture today is the politics of the mutual effort of sameness and difference to [cannibalise] one another and thereby proclaim their successful hijacking of the twin Enlightenment ideas of the triumphantly universal and the resiliently particular" (43). What is more, the polarity between sameness and difference is now all the more complicated as the global cultural economy is characterised as "a complex, overlapping, disjunctive order" (Appadurai 32). A world which consists of "fundamental disjunctures" between media, technology and finance no longer allows for either a simple framework of the world (through centre-periphery models) or a

simple term definition (e.g. the term "democracy" does not merely refer to an American-style political philosophy). As such, the individual is "the last locus" to grasp the chaos of contemporary world, and Murakami's characters face these difficulties. In the following section, we shall see how Murakami's sense of "ordinariness" defines an idea of subjectivity compatible with a collective logic.

A PERSONALISED UTOPIA

Murakami's *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* uses the conventional form of utopian narrative, in which the protagonist is a new-comer to an unknown place. The story of "The End of the World" starts his arriving in a nameless town and, thereafter, we know detailed contents of this town through his point of view. The inhabitants are all equal, free from suffering and hate, and as time stops, everybody gains immortality. They live in co-operation with nature, along with "beasts" whose shape looks like unicorns. Yet, the protagonist also realises that such tranquillity is established by the inhabitants who are deprived of all feelings, such as sadness, anger or happiness. Also, while there is no place for competition and ambition, the people in this town have little sense of progress.

The town is surrounded by a "Wall", which is repeatedly described as "a perfect creation" (*HWEW* 148). The Wall never allows inhabitants to go out. A Colonel warns the protagonist that the Wall is "impenetrable and it encloses us irrevocably"; as well, it "sees everything that transpires within" (146). Besides, the protagonist is told that the life of the small town is thoroughly organised by "the Law", which is unseen but all-powerful and pervasive.[1] When the protagonist asks the reason why the beasts must be outside the Wall at night, the Gatekeeper answers that the habits, customs and social protocols of the town are all unquestionable: "We do it that way, and that is how it is. The same as the sun rising in the east and setting in the west." (15). The ageing Colonel explains that the town has "its own protocol" and he adds:

> The Town is fair in its own way. The things you need, the things you need to know, one by one the Town will set these before you. Hear me now: this Town is perfect. And by perfect, I mean complete. It has everything. If you cannot see that, then it has nothing. A perfect nothing. (86)

The novel highlights the perfect nature of the town, as opposed to the "imperfectness" of the protagonist. To be "imperfect" means to be "unformed",

---

[1] The description of "the Law"in Murakami's novel can be compared with Jacques Derrida's "Before the Law" (1992), a study of Kafka's short parable.

which implies having doubts, curiosity, contradictions, regrets, and so on (146). To be a "perfect" inhabitant, the protagonist has to undertake the town's prescribed ritual, through which his shadow is removed. Under the "Law" of the town, all visitors who wish to go to the city are required to discard their shadows, insofar as a shadow carries all feelings. Seeing the protagonist's dismay and reluctance to follow this law, the Gatekeeper says: "You have to endure. If you endure, everything will be fine. No worry, no suffering. It all disappears. Forget about the shadow. This is the End of the World. This is where the world ends. Nowhere further to go" (109). In order to adjust himself to the new life, the protagonist also needs to follow the other social protocols. Thus he has to find a new job, since no one is allowed to live without working. The job assigned to him is to read dreams from the skulls of dead beasts. Yet the protagonist finds great difficulty in doing it. He is simply told that it is his incompleteness that distracts him and disables him for the service.

Indeed, perfection in this peaceful town is achieved at the expense of human feelings. Thus, he realises that the inhabitants are devoid of any interests in others. The protagonist (the "Dreamreader") becomes aware that the librarian with whom he is in love may never reciprocate his love. The Colonel tells him that she cannot love; yet, she is "fond" of him, and the old man thinks of it as satisfactory enough (170). To him, it is better to have "undisturbed, peaceful living" rather than having painful feelings. The jettisoning of human feelings is an important part of building up this utopian world. This town is a utopia which is "an achieved practice", whereby the inhabitants are granted much a "deeper, stronger" and peaceful life (*HWEW* 170).

Nevertheless, the still "unformed" protagonist believes that something is missing in this complete town. Looking at some former soldiers digging a hole, he wonders about the reason for this activity. The Colonel replies:

> It has no special meaning, does not transport them anywhere. All of us dig at our own pure holes. We have nothing to achieve by our activities, nowhere to get to. Is there not something [marvellous] about this? We hurt no one and no one gets hurt. No victory, no defeat. (*HWEW* 317)

The implication in his words is a sort of innocence which the inhabitants possess; they simply enjoy the performance itself with no sense of competition, progress, and ambition. While the protagonist always wishes to know the "meaning" and "purpose" in every action, the Colonel's words here reject the necessity of having a purpose and aim in every action.

Referring to this scene, the literary critic Murakami Fuminobu (2002) argues that Murakami's town describes a "postmodern utopia" (333). He considers that "The End of the World" indicates "a paradigm shift from modernism to postmodernism", i.e. a change "from an obsession with evolution and love to an indifferent egalitarianism based on fairness or justice without force" (127).[2] Thus, the critic defines "postmodern utopia" as the outcome of "the failure of modernism". Although the veracity of this discussion needs careful examination, his criticism is suggestive in regards to Murakami's criticism of modern Japanese history. The Colonel's words, as quoted above, echoes Murakami's question about "the meaning" which Japan desperately searched for in its process of Western modernisation. In this sense, the characters of the novel refuse to seek such a "meaning" in life, insofar as this meaning implies imperialism, militarism, and wars. The scene in which the former solders are aimlessly digging a hole suggests that a sense of progress and ambition should be abandoned, as far as these feelings caused conflicts between the individuals, as demonstrated by the numerous wars in human history. The Colonel says:

> For many years, I led the life of a soldier. I do not regret that; it was a fine life. The smell of gunsmoke and blood, the flash of sabers, the call of the bungle. I sometimes still think about the drama. Yet I cannot recall what it was that sent us charging into the fray. Honour? Patriotism? A thirst for combat? Hatred? I can only guess. (317-8)

---

[2] Murakami Fuminobu (2002) defines modernism as "an ideology in which power struggle is dominant". He states that "wars are the consequence of the paranoid modern ideology of identification and differentiation, [individualisation] and [totalisation]" (129).

"The End of the World" represents a place where human history ends after the failed search for universal meanings and truths. The town prefers a perfectly peaceful world in which nobody is hurt or disheartened.

However, this tranquil community is rejected by the protagonist's shadow, which firmly denies the idea that this is the most ideal world. Although it admits that this town "would be truly a utopia" (333), it tells the Dreamreader that he fails to be aware of the absence of something very important in this town:

> Last time I met you, I said that the town is unnatural and wrong; the town is perfect and complete in this unnaturality and incorrectness. Now you talk about the completeness and perfection of this town. So I am referring to the non-natural and wrong aspects of the town. Listen to me. First of all, this is the essential subject for this discussion. Perfection never exists in our world, as, theoretically, a machine never works eternally. Entropy constantly increases. Then how the town discharges it? Certainly people here, except probably the Gatekeeper, never hurt each other, never hate each other, never hold desire. Everybody is content in the peaceful life. Do you know why? Because they have no feelings. (219) [3]

The concept of entropy is an important motif in dystopian literature. For instance, Zamyatin uses this scientific theory in his novel *We*, in order to express social stability, orthodoxy, peace, and the death of the subject, as opposed to the sun energy which stands for social progress, unorthodoxy, revolutionary passion and the activity of individual spirit (Misawa 170). Through this comparison, Zamyatin conveys the impossibility of preserving the absolute stability of dystopia, suggesting that the power of an individual will ultimately cause a revolution. Likewise, the shadow in Murakami's *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* calls the possibility of creating a perfect stability into question.

Despite his shadow's objection, the protagonist decides to remain in the town. This decision has been a controversial topic for literary critics. Susan Napier (1996) considers that the protagonist's decision to be "admirable" and "emblematic of a

---

[3] Although this discussion between the Shadow and the protagonist is an essential scene, the translator simplifies it and omits some details. Thus, the page numbers refer to the original Japanese text and the translation is mine.

generation which [realises] that to change the world one must start with oneself" (214). On the other hand, Karatani Kojin's interpretation (1995) is rather critical: "The responsibility for…things one has created by one's own discretion is another name for irresponsibility. To emphasise the responsibility for meaningless things is to make the responsibility worthless" (qtd. in F. Murakami 133). However the critical opinions differ as such, one thing is certain; Murakami dared to choose this ending for this novel. The story of "The End of the World" was based on a short story of Murakami, "The Town and the Uncertain Wall" (1980). A comparison between these two stories provides us with an interesting interpretation. In the end of the short story (1980), the protagonist eventually escapes from the town by using a rope to tie together his body and shadow, and then starts writing about his experience in the perfect town. The different ending in "The End of the World" clearly suggests a considerable change in the author's thematic concerns. It implies that some ethical and moral issues are added; for the protagonist decides to stay in the town in order to understand how and why he has created this ideal, yet motionless and emotionless town in his own consciousness.

The narrative of "The End of the World" may be categorised as fantasy. In order to enquire into the moral and ethical issues the author presents, we need to examine the function of the fantastic narrative which Murakami deliberately uses. While Alasdair Gray explains the social and cultural problems of Glasgow through fantasy (Chapter III), Murakami applies fantasy in his depiction of the imaginative world created within the individual's consciousness. The fantastic nature of "The End of the World" is amplified through mysterious animals like beasts, whose bodies are similar to those of unicorns. Moreover, the narrative's fantastic mode amplified by some magical rituals (for instance, as a necessary ritual given to newcomers, the Gatekeeper pushes his knife into the protagonist's eyeball).[4] Unrealistic characters, such as "the INKlings" and "the Sheepman", add a non-Japanese atmosphere to the novel. This shows Murakami's departure from traditional Japanese literature, as

---

[4] See *HWEW* (40).

represented by the dominant style of the "I-novel".[5] Whereas the I-novel" focuses on the author's actual experiences and feelings, Murakami challenges this literary form by questioning what can be observed as essentially "real" in our life. As a result, his sense of uncertainty equalises all the creatures and phenomenon; the author illustrates the strange creatures called "INKlings" ("Infra-Nocturnal Kappa"), which live underground and eat the city garbage. Sometimes, they kidnap subway workmen and eat them (*HWEW* 138). Murakami's minute depiction of these unrealistic characters does not require the reader of any particular knowledge of Japanese tradition and thus the fantastic nature of Murakami's text makes it easier for readers outside of Japan to approach his work. Accordingly, his novels offer a common place for readers across the world, so that his thematic concerns can be more easily shared by them.

Murakami's use of fantasy in the field of utopian studies offers a suggestive perspective. On one hand, it corresponds to contemporary cultural phenomena. Susan Napier (1996) provides two justifications: first, his text reflects the growing scepticism toward traditional realism; second, his work illustrates the increasing popularity of fantasy in popular culture (10). More importantly, the presence of fantasy in Murakami's text demonstrates the increasing tendency to use the fantastic in contemporary utopian literature. Indeed, it is no longer possible to define utopia through the notion of progress, as witnessed in the eighteenth century. Such a rational project is viewed as potentially totalitarian. As Ruth Levitas writes, "Utopia implies drawing up blueprints for the future and supposing that they can be realised through sheer force of will; impossibility and voluntarism mean that utopia is counter-revolutionary" (1991: 257). In this sense, to describe a fantasy world is

---

[5] The Japanese novelist Ito Sei defines the "I-novel" as follows: "Within so-called 'pure' literature there are certain types of themes which are easily handed, and others which are extremely difficult to write about. Thus, 'pure' literature lies implicitly within fairly narrow boundaries. Works written within these thematic and technical limits really have little to do with questions of quality; the essence of "pure" literature is reality. Needless to say, the theme which goes best with this—and which is now accepted in our own time—is the I-novelist's technique of letting the reader [internalise] the author's true account or confession, superimposing himself upon the hero he portrays. Naturally, the value of such a work is largely dependent upon the moral will or human condition the author portrays through his hero"(qtd. in Strecher 56-7). See also Chapter V of this thesis.

regarded as the alternative way to produce a utopia without the negative requirement of rationality. Murakami's *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* constitutes a perfect illustration of this view. We must now wonder how Murakami incorporates fantasy with his aim to describe the individual's subjectivity through an ordinary everyday life.

We need to compare the conventional forms of fantasy with Murakami's fantastic mode. Rosemary Jackson's *Fantasy: the Literature of Subversion* (1981) describes fantasy as subversive in the sense that the fantastic narrative reveals "the unsaid and the unseen of culture" (4).[6] A fantastic narrative overthrows what we take for granted as reality. According to Kathryn Hume (1984), fantasy is "any departure from consensus reality" (21); and Susan Napier (1996) adds that fantasy is any "*conscious*" departure from consensus reality (9). The authors of the fantastic narratives generally aim to destabilise common sense, to doubt the established social protocols, and to overthrow the dominant cultural and social viewpoint. They question the meaning of "reality" and wants to dissolve authoritative truths. Fantasy is, in Bakhtin's argument, characterised as being hostile to a static, discretely unified, ordered system. He states that fantasy "frees human behaviour from predetermining norms and motivations" (qtd. in Jackson 96). Fantastic narratives intend to deconstruct the social norms and to destroy the "violently" closed, omniscient and absolute vision of reality. They suspend certainties, laws and orders. The fantastic promotes "opening" activity that radically decentres any forces which tend to legitimatise how to interpret the world, and it also investigates the determining social practices.[7]

The "opening" activity of the fantastic also infers "the unseen", which is against reality and the power of authority. Dostoevsky writes, "Reality is not limited to the familiar, the commonplace, for it consists in huge part of a *latent, as yet unspoken future word*" (qtd. in Jackson 19). The fantastic narrative provides the reader with an in-between sphere between reality and unreality. Jackson claims that

---

[6] Jackson identifies "fantasy" with "the fantastic" in her argument. This thesis follows her way.
[7] Cf. The third section of Chapter II.

the fantastic, "whose imaginary world is neither entirely 'real' (object), nor entirely 'unreal' (image)" is located somewhere between the two (19). The reader is "suspended" between the two modes of being, and the role of the fantastic, according to Jackson, is to "pull the reader from the apparent familiarity and security of the known and everyday world into something more strange, into a world whose improbabilities are closer to the realm normally associated with the marvellous" (34). Such a role of the fantastic seduces the reader into questioning whether what they are shown is truly "real". The higher the tension between the two worlds becomes, the more the degree of suspense is heightened. The topology of fantasy indicates that the fantasy reveals the "limits" of the epistemological and ontological frames of the reader's everyday life (Jackson 23). Such "limits" infer the space of the "absent" and "unseen", which forces the reader to abandon the absolute certainties and objective truths of reality. Novalis describes fantasy as "narrative without coherence but rather with association, like dreams… full of words, but without any meaning and coherence…like fragments, but they do not escape into it. In their *waking* dreams, it is the strange relation between the 'real' and its representation which is their concern." (qtd. in Jackson 37). Language no longer articulates the truth, meaning that the gap between signifier and signified is closed in realistic narrative (and in classic narrative cinema); in contrast, it is left open in fantastic literature (and in the fantastic cinema) (Jackson 40). In this respect, a fantastic narrative, as Bessière writes, becomes "the most artificial and deliberate mode of literary narrative" because it is constructed "on the affirmation of emptiness" (qtd. in Jackson 37). Therefore, any inquiry into "truth" and "reality" ultimately ends with an open conclusion without any fixed answer.

The emphasis upon the disintegration of an authorised value judgement is closely related to the formation of personality in modern fantastic narratives. Fantasy's resistance against any authorised conclusions or synthesis provokes "a grotesque dissolution, a promiscuity" in the individual's consciousness. The process of disintegration within the individual's view of the world inverts the topology of reality and unreality. Sartre writes that the aim of the fantastic is to invert our

naturalised world, such that the secularised and materialistic world of capitalism becomes something "strange, something 'other'" (qtd. in Jackson 17). Otherness is located in a world of subjectivity, projecting human fears and desires. Lévy holds that "the fantastic is a compensation that man provides for himself, at the level of imagination [*l'imaginaire*], for what he has lost at the level of faith" (qtd. in Jackson 18). What the protagonist has lost "at the level of faith" is discovered through a fantastic vision, which breaks down with the real objects of consciousness. Therefore, fantasy is the central feature of an imaginative, ideal world.

Nonetheless, Kathryn Hume's *Fantasy and Mimesis* (1984) carefully distinguishes fantasy from utopia because of the completeness of utopian literature. She writes: "The perfection of utopias may well be impossible in our world, and yet be desirable." (22). Rosemary Jackson points to another crucial difference between fantasy and utopia, in the sense that the fantastic "is moving towards the non-conceptual" and has "little faith" in ideals or ideas. Utopia, by contrast, is a product of ideas and theories. Such objections make sense, insofar as a utopian discourse has a rational and didactic purpose; thus, fantasy can be opposed to the conventional style and form of utopia.

Yet, Murakami's utopia is by no means contrary to the fantastic. On the contrary, his text demonstrates how the function of suspense, which can be identified with a function of defamiliarisation, is effectively used in his utopian text. The dual structure of Murakami's *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* is meant to question the existence of reality. It seems that the story of "Hard-boiled Wonderland" is more realistic than the story of "The End of the World". Such a belief is maintained as long as the reader thinks of these two stories as independent of each other. (As was mentioned in the previous section, in the Japanese text, the irrelevance of the two stories is stressed by the author's distinct use of two styles of pronoun, "watashi" and "boku", in each story). Yet this interpretation is overthrown when the reader knows that the world of "The End of the World" is a visualised picture produced within the consciousness of the protagonist in "Hard-boiled Wonderland". Mathew Strecher (1998) claims that the two places in the two stories

are "in fact not opposites, but simply the same place seen through different modes of consciousness" (361). The reader then learns that the life of "The End of the World" is more "essential" than the world of "Hard-boiled". Indeed, the old scientist in "Hard-boiled Wonderland" tells the protagonist: "This very moment you're preparin' t'move to another world. So the world you see right now is changin' bit by bit t'match up.... The world here and now does exist. But on the phenomenological level, this world is only one out of countless possibilities" (*HWEW* 283). Thus, the dual structure of Murakami's novel is deliberately set up in order to challenge the reader's perception of reality.

Like the scientist's assertion, the fantastic section plays, in consequence, the more significant role in the whole plot of the novel. This process is complete when the protagonist decides not to leave the world of fantasy. The implication is that the world of fantasy is more "real" and important. Throughout the novel, we are told that the immortal, peaceful yet emotionless life of "The End of the World" is "true" in the sense that the images of the town and of its people lie at the core of the protagonist's mind. The novel implies that utopia, whose existence is nowhere but in the bottom of the man's consciousness, is "more real" than anything else. In this sense, Murakami perfectly combines the two literary genres of utopia and fantasy. Strecher (1997) puts it thus:

> Like these authors, Murakami experiments with language, genre, realism, and fantasy, in order to explore the outer limits of postmodern expression. Murakami may be unique among his peers, however, for his remarkable ability to bring an insightful understanding of the literary formula to his experiments with genre, demonstrating a knack for reproducing the structures of such texts, while at the same time maintaining a less obvious seriousness which lies beneath these formulaic structures. (356)

Murakami provides a new approach to utopian and fantastic literatures. His novel directs us the place of "the unseen" in our everyday life, and suggests that this hidden sphere is more "real" and essential to the constitution of the individual. Thus the scientist in the novel tries to convince the protagonist that the world in which he lives is a mere "momentary fantasy" (*HWEW* 290). Moreover, he says that, when the

protagonist discovers "the unseen" and "unsaid" in his self-made utopia, he then becomes "himself" (290). Then, the investigation into the contents and features of the imaginative world becomes a crucial issue to the protagonist.

The protagonist's final decision to stay in his utopia bespeaks the desire to discover the way to be "himself". This means that he tries to find "the unseen" within himself, which is suggested as the reason for the "completeness" of his imagined world. As he realises in the end, this imagined utopia is made to *protect* him from the chaotic earthly world (as seen in "Hard-boiled Wonderland"), and is the result of his inability to open up his mind to the outside world. This is most suggestively inferred in the scene in which the protagonist, as the Dreamreader, tries to read dreams from the skulls of beasts. He encounters great difficulties in understanding them and finds himself totally at loss:

> Dreamreading proves not as effortless as she has explained. The threads of light are so fine that despite how I concentrate the energies in my fingertips, I am incapable of unravelling the chaos of vision. Even so, I clearly sense the presence of dreams at my fingertips. It is a busy current, an endless stream of images. My fingers are as yet unable to grasp any distinct message, but I do apprehend an intensity there. (61)

To him, the incomprehensible messages are "the chaos of vision" and "endless stream of images". They are fragmented, with no coherence, and do not provide any meaning. The protagonist perceives "sadness" from one of the skulls on the table, yet he is unable to describe this pathos with specific words (59). His own work does not satisfy him since he cannot "divine the message of the dreams"; he aimlessly continues reading "indecipherable texts" buried in the beasts' skulls. As he desperately tries to unite "indistinct fragments that never merge into a sensate picture" (184), the librarian gives a key to cope with this predicament. She implies that the protagonist's failure is related to his "closed" mind, which prevents him from understanding the dreams of the dead beasts (183). He must open up his confined mind, and must thereby break down the Wall of his utopia.

The protagonist must discover something "unseen" in himself. His final decision to stay in the town suggests a will to face his responsibility for the creation of his own utopia. Thus, he says to his own shadow:

> I have responsibilities. I cannot forsake the people and places and things I have created. I know I do you a terrible wrong. And yes, perhaps I wrong myself, too. But I must see out the consequences of my own doings. This is my world. The Wall is here to hold *me* in, the River flows through *me*, the smoke is *me* burning. I must know why. (*HWEW* 399)

His final decision to stay in the town signifies his will to break through the perfection of his own world. Besides, it is implied that a new perception of the world and the self must be pursued endlessly, as life itself is always moving and changing. The Colonel tells him: "[The] rest you must learn for yourself. Open your eyes, train your ears, use your head. If a mind you have, then use it while you can" (86).[8] Therefore, all signs and codes in this town must be understood by the protagonist himself, insofar as he is the creator of this changeless world.

Fantasy, in Murakami's text, does not only aim to subvert reality, since it stresses that the fantastic world *is* real in the sense that the resource of imagining the world is nowhere but his own consciousness. The author's thematic concern is outlined in the epigraph to the novel:[9]

> Why does the sun go on shining
> Why do the birds go on singing
> Don't they know
> It's the end of the world

This epigraph is taken from Skeeter Davis's song, "The End of the World" (Miyakawa 1988). We may notice that the last line of each stanza in the original song is cut off in the epigraph of Murakami's text. In Skeeter's song, each stanza ends with the line: "'Cause you don't love me any more". The absence of this final line

---

[8] This translation omits one sentence from the original text, since the Colonel also advises him to "grasp what the town signifies".
[9] This epigraph is only inserted in the original text in Japanese.

illustrates the subject of Murakami's novel, namely: our world would be over if humankind lost humanity, love and compassion. The protagonist in the end takes on the challenge of grasping such human values in order to rescue himself from nothingness, i.e. from the "end of the world". Murakami's novel can be viewed as a heuristic text, which makes us reconsider ourselves as well as the world which surrounds us.

Murakami's Postmodern Political Consciousness

Murakami's novel illustrates downsized and personalised utopia; as such, it gives the impression to be apolitical and escapist. In the early years of his literary career, Murakami was regarded as an "apolitical" writer who was not interested in dealing with social and political issues. In his speech for the Nobel Prize of Literature (1994), Kenzaburo Oe criticises contemporary writers, such as Murakami, in that they represent "the experience of a youth politically uninvolved or disaffected, content to exist within a late adolescent or post-adolescent subculture" (50). He believes that the writers' mood of the new generation has caused the decline of Japanese literature (1988: 359). Oe's negative comments is connected to his strong belief in the defence of "pure" literature, i.e. the "*junbungaku*" defined as the classical and canonical genre of Japanese literature. He condemns today's literary industry in Japan, and writes, "There is not one work of *junbungaku* to be found in the 1985 list of the ten best-selling Japanese books in either fiction or non-fiction" (ibid. 363). From Oe's point of view, Murakami is one of those young writers whose works will debilitate the intellectual mission of the writers of high literature. His criticism is based on his definition of the role of the author. Oe holds that the author's social task is to depict a universal ideal for the well-being of humankind. As a war evacuee, Oe witnessed Japan's defeat in the Second World War along with the introduction of democracy; in this sense, he values the "power to create an active model for the contemporary age and for the future". Therefore, literature has a historical role to play; he writes: "[Insofar] as man is obviously a historical being—[it] is to create a model of a contemporary age which envelops past and future and a human model that lives in that age" (1988: 360). In other words, a novel must express transcendental values which appeal to all people across the world.

By contrast, contemporary writers seem to lack an ethical or political sense. Referring to the argument initiated by the Nobel laureate, Susan Napier (1996) argues as follows:

> [While] the older generation of postwar writers still held on to some ideals even as they described the alienation and materialism of modern Japan…the most

> recent generation of dystopian writers are notable for their lack of any moral [centre]. Thus, Murakami Haruki creates a world of materialism and corruption where the only basis for moral authority is in the individual.... [The] most recent Japanese dystopias highlight a world in which tradition, be it elite or folk, and moral values are totally lost, and this loss is seen as a release rather than a tragedy. (197-8)

Oe's principle that a writer must provide "a total, comprehensive contemporary age and a human model that lived it" (361) contradicts some features of postmodern consciousness such as a non-critical and simplistic celebration of the mundane (Strecher 1997: 371). Oe's views on literature also remind us of Krishan Kumar's nostalgia for an authentic utopian literature which offer a universal social vision for the well-being of humankind. Kumar laments the diminution of utopian literature in the postmodern era in the same way that Oe criticises the young writers who live in a "subcultural fad in an urbanised, average consumer culture", and lose the spirit possessed by the previous writers like Oe himself (366).

Such a negative response to the novels by writers of the new generation is attributed to their description of characters, who are content with living in their own private world. Murakami is one of the prominent writers who portray such characters. In *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* he deals with the mundane character who shows little interest in committing himself to the outside world. The protagonist in this novel is a middle-aged single man living in contemporary Tokyo, and is a specialist at "Cultec", which operates secret codes for large corporations. Being talented in his field, he is well-established professional and earns enough money to support himself. Yet, he is not particularly proud of his technical job, and money is by no means the ultimate purpose; he rather dreams to save enough in order to spend the rest of his life, playing guitar in exotic places. He is not interested in political and social issues, and does not read newspapers regularly. Rather than being sociable, he prefers building a huge collection of books and CDs, and cooks Western recipes. The following passage well summarises his lifestyle:

> There wasn't a speck of mail in the mailbox. Nor any message on the answering machine. No one had any business with me, it seemed. Fine. I had no business

> with anyone else either. I took some ice out of the freezer, poured myself a large quantity of whiskey, and added a splash of soda. Then I got undressed and, crawling under the covers, sat up in bed and sipped my drink. I felt like I was going to fade out any second, but I had to allow myself this luxury. A ritual interlude I like so much between the time I get into bed and the time I fall asleep. Having a drink in bed while listening to music and reading a book. As precious to me as a beautiful sunset or good clean air. (*HWEW* 67)

Murakami's minute depiction evokes in the protagonist's strong attachment to his small-scale, self-absorbed life. He controls his life-style, insofar as he organises his own time schedule.[1] He tries to free himself from the outside pressure, so that he can construct a small world for his own sake, and find modest pleasures in listening music, cooking, and shopping. Murakami's protagonist often becomes the target of criticisms because it illustrates the tendency for the new generation to be "uninvolved or unaffected" politically.

From another perspective, however, it could be said that Murakami illustrates such a protagonist for the purpose of considering an individual consciousness typical of the contemporary age. The author seems to infer that his characters are "the product of a historical moment in which society has gradually, systematically isolated its members from meaningful contact with one another" (Strecher 42). As his style of language suggests, he does not aspire to promulgate a single, exemplary model, in the sense that he places great emphasis on the complexity of today's world in which all connections between causes and effects are unclear. He claims: "My opinion is that all of us—English, Americans, Japanese, Chinese—are living in chaos, utter chaos" (*Financial Times*, February 2003). Analysing the attack of the religious cult Aum, which released sarin in Tokyo's subway in 1995, Murakami's *Underground* (1999) concludes the book with the following questions: "Is the narrative you now possess really and truly your own? Are your dreams really your own dreams? Might not they be someone else's visions that could sooner or later turn into nightmares?" (754). Such questions remain unanswered, since we are involved in a network of boundless information which we cannot completely grasp. In *Hard-*

---

[1] Murakami's depiction of time may provide an interesting contrast to those of dystopian writers such as Gray and Orwell.

boiled Wonderland and the End of the World, the people who possess the ultimate power of information is symbolically termed "them"; and the novel indicates that their power is elusive, all-powerful, and pervasive. (This expression is also used in another novel called *Wild Sheep Chase*.) In the beginning, the protagonist believes there are two powerful organisations—"Factory" and "System"—in his society and that they compete against each other. Yet, he realises that both organisations depend on a large private corporation, such that "Factory" is the "left hand" and "System" is the "right hand". This discovery makes him aware of the complexity and boundlessness of the society in which he lives.

Murakami symbolically describes the chaotic and complicated formation of the world in the chapter titles of the text. In each chapter, he puts a subtitle such as "Appetite, Disappointment, Leningrad". At first sight, these words give no clue for understanding the connection between them. They do not play the supposed role of a title, and the random succession of words seems meaningless. Such a chapter title does not outlines the subject of a narrative, but it symbolises the complexity of the world, suggesting how these apparently irrelevant factors are in fact connected in profound ways. It is this realisation that signals a change in the protagonist's life. The novel then shows his commitments towards social and political problems, as revealed in the following passage:

> Winding our way out of the residential backstreets, we got to the main drag. It was surprisingly busy for this hour, mostly taxis. Why were so many people out racing around in the middle of the night? Why couldn't they just leave work at six o'clock, go home, and lights-out by ten? But that, as they say, was none of my business. OPEC would go on drilling for oil, regardless of anyone's opinion, conglomerates would make electricity and gasoline from that oil, people would be running around town late at night using up that gasoline. At the moment, however, I had my own problems to deal with. (*HWEW* 188)

Murakami's protagonist realises that he is the only one capable of unifying and solving all the enigmatic problems surrounding him. The elderly scientist also tells that he is the only agent who can challenge the problem of "The End of the World". It is him who can save his life itself, and more importantly, prevent "the end of the

world".

The protagonist becomes more and more aware of an unavoidable engagement with society, as he finds himself involved in enigmatic incidents. Such a plot is close to the one made by Kobo Abe (Chapter IV), who is also interested in describing the inescapable connection between the individual and society.[2] At first, Murakami's protagonist is dismayed by the mysterious incidents which suddenly happen to him; he questions, "Why were all these bizarre things happening to me? What had I ever done to deserve this? I was just your practical-minded, lone-wolf Calcutec. I wasn't overly ambitious, wasn't greedy. Didn't have family, friends, or lovers. … How on earth did I get mixed up in this?" (*HWEW* 80) Yet Murakami's novel is different from Abe's, since his novel stresses that the protagonist is the last hope to solve the enigmatic problems confronting the society.

However, the rise of a new political consciousness within the protagonist does not suggest a revival of the sense of historical mission which the writers of former generations aimed to demonstrate. Certainly, a series of incidents in which he is involved gives the protagonist a new sense of social responsibility. Nevertheless we are shown that the ultimate answer is a return to selfhood insofar as the novel describes a sense of hopelessness and isolation which becomes stronger when the protagonist tries to find his own position in the outside world:

> I looked at my watch. Seven-eighteen. Above ground, morning news on every TV channel. People eating breakfast, cramming their half-asleep heads with the weather, headache remedies, car export trade problems with America. Who'd know that I'd spent the whole night in the colon of the world? Did they care that I'd been swimming in stinking water and had leeches feeding on my neck, that I'd nearly keeled over from the pain in my gut? Did it matter to anybody that my reality would end in another twenty-eight hours and forty-two minutes? It'd never make the news. (301-2)

The protagonist's interest in society grows, but his feeling of isolation is

---

[2] Murakami is aware of the affinity of his novel with Abe's. In his interview with Mcinerney (1992), he claims that he is more familiar to Abe's work than to the other major post-war Japanese novels, such as Mishima's and Oe's (201).

strengthened. The novel tells us that personal feelings, such as aloofness and seclusion, will never be solved as long as the individual lives in today's society.[3]

Murakami's depiction of hopelessness can be interpreted as the result of a social and cultural mood related to materialism. Matthew Strecher (1995) states:

> What happened, in Murakami's world, at any rate, is that the mood of confrontation and resistance turned into a late-model consumer capitalist society which learned to occupy itself with consumption rather than with politics... What follows the 1960s in Japan, in Murakami's portrayal, at least, is an extended period of boredom, during which the nation grows more comfortable and complacent with its economic success. (52, 68)

Likewise, Celeste Loughman (1997) connects the individuals' loss of spiritual basis to the material abundance in city life: "[Murakami] is pointing out the emptiness of the signs, *which signify nothing beyond their momentary, superficial function.* Ignoring their traditional culture which absorbing the forms but not the substance of another culture, his people have lost their moorings and are adrift (88). In his study of consumer culture, Stuart Ewen (1988) examines how consumer culture reduces the originality of the individuals to a mere commodity:

> The essential quality of a consumer society—marked as it is by the continuous cultivation of markets, obsessive/compulsive shopping, and premeditated waste—has made ever-changing style a cardinal feature of economic life, and of popular perception. Suspended in this cultural miasma, the "memories" of style are many, but as they unfold, historical recollection—the ability to comprehend social forces at work, to draw meaning from a social environment—is reduced to a flickering procession of familiar images. (1082)

---

[3] This experience can be shared by readers. Many readers from the Eastern world highly estimate the feeling of isolation in Murakami's world. In India, his novels are highly valued as marking the age of a new literary canon. In Thailand, the "enigmatic attraction" of Murakami's work is focused by media (2003), and they emphasise the sense of loneliness as the result of capitalism. A Thai translator comments that the novel "leaves some gaps in his stories for us to fill in with our own experience or feeling". He goes on to state: "He [Murakami] probably tries to tell us that it is not important to find what we are looking for, or that all those things, answers, ideals all of us try to look for many not exist. For that reason, we might as well try to find the meaning to our life in the process of searching, to feel okay even in darkness". In China, his readership is mainly composed of people under 40 years old. Like in Thailand, Chinese young readers value Murakami's description of solitude and his questioning about life.

Late capitalism advances a life of convenience and abundance, yet it leads individuals to lose basic human connections by placing them in pure materialism. Accordingly, the conviction of one's subjectivity and originality becomes weaker, and the foundation whereby each individual is supposed to assure one's own location in society becomes unstable and fragile. Thus, at the end of "Hard-boiled Wonderland", the protagonist reaches the conclusion that his life is a sort of mosaic, i.e. an accumulation of insignificant things. He admits: "It's how my life has always been. Gathering up the junk, sorting through it, and then casting it off somewhere else. All for no purpose, leaving it to wash away again" (*HWEW* 375). In the fantastic world of "The End of the World", the lack of individuality is highlighted, as no personal stories and tastes are valued in the town. By the same token, particular forms or beauty are unnecessary (293). In this town, there are no real foods, since all foods are mere imitations, as the Librarian explains to the protagonist: "What resembles meat is not. What resembles eggs is not. What resembles coffee only resembles coffee. Everything is made in the image of something" (224). These illustrations imply a strong criticism against capitalism.[4] Stretcher (1995) writes: "If anything, the 1980s only intensified the problem of the isolated subject. Consumers moved in this period of late-model capitalism from the consumption of consumer goods, to the consumption of the simulated, commodified, 'empty sign'" (42-3). The solution is to maintain one's small world and to discover something very substantial and meaningful within this living unity. Ultimately, *Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World* suggests that making one's own "narrative" is the only possible solution.

Murakami's novel does not suggest a complete rejection of the capitalist society, insofar as its characters try to construct a protected way of life within capitalism. They know how to enjoy a huge volume of commodities, taking advantage of them in their private life by finding items suitable to their personal tastes. For instance, the protagonist has his own definition of "good sofa" and claims

---

[4] Cf. Slavoj Zizek's *Welcome to the Desert of the Real* (2002).

that the choice of a sofa tells a lot about the person who makes the choice:

> I always say—a prejudice on my part, I'm sure—you can tell a lot about a person's character from his choice of sofa. Sofas constitute a realm inviolate unto themselves. This, however, is something that only those who have grown up sitting on good sofas will appreciate. It's like growing up reading good books or listening to good music. One good sofa breeds another good sofa; one bad sofa breeds another bad sofa. That's how it goes. (45)

He likes shopping to the extent that he believes to be "a born shopper" (71). Murakami portrays a sense of enjoyment and fulfilment through the selection of commodities. His novel demonstrates what Mike Featherstone calls the "stylisation of everyday life" and the "beautification of life" (116). Murakami is critical of consumerism, but does not reject materialism; he interprets Japan's economic growth in the seventies with the sentence: "we became rich" (*Union News* 41). Loughman writes: "Murakami shows that neither materialism itself nor the preference for Western popular culture is the problem. The problem is that that's all there is. The idealism which has disappeared has not been replaced with anything else as a source of meaning and self-fulfilment" (90). Yet, Loughman's argument fails to acknowledge that Murakami's purpose is not to challenge the social and cultural condition of late capitalism. Murakami depicts possible positive ways of life in our contemporary world, which do not imply the reconstruction of the rational ideologies of the past. He has a positive attitude towards contemporary life and values "individuality" and "distinction". The distinctiveness of each individual is the basis on which one constructs one's own private worlds. As such, it is impossible to change one's own character, as the protagonist admits it at the end of the novel: "Even if I had my life to live over again, I couldn't imagine not doing things the same. After all, everything—this life I was losing—was me. And I couldn't be any other self but myself. Could I?" (341) Murakami's characters embody "constituent monads", whose ceaseless activities among commodities aspire to construct a better inner world.[5] In an interview in 2003, Murakami states: "I think the bursting of the

---

[5] Marilyn Ivey deals with the economic transformation of Japan, and writes: "...using the home, family, and consumer goods as the basis...the [bureaucratised], technocratic public sphere has succeeded in consolidating its control". In this coordinated effort of the industry and the mass media,

bubble economy was good for Japan. When we were rich, I hated this society. It was stupid, foolish, arrogant". Then he goes on to say: "Now we are lost and we don't know which way to go. But I think that is very natural, very healthy". Murakami witnesses the arrival of a young generation preferring to be part-time workers at the expense of the conventional job-for-life system, and he agrees with this tendency: "They choose to be free, they have their own opinions. They have their alternatives. I think the more alternatives we have, the more open our society will be" (*Financial Times* August 2003). He encourages younger generations to value individuality and distinction as opposed to an indistinct and authoritarian collectivism.

The concept of subjectivity needs to be considered in terms of two opposing forces, namely diversity and homogeneity. The dilemma between these two forces is stressed by Gordon Mathews' *Global Culture/Individual Identity* (2000). He describes culture as "the way of life of a people", and identifies two styles of "culture" emerging in the economic and social environment. The postmodern notion of diversity values the uniqueness of each culture, claiming that cultures cannot be judged against one another. Yet, "culture" is also defined as "the information and identities available from the global cultural supermarket". Matthews draws on the image that people pick up their cultural identities in the same way that they can choose their favourite foods and commodities. In this case, culture is no longer confined to the nation or tradition to which the individual belongs, and Mathews fears that a culture shaped by the force of market brings about the concept that "one's home is all the world" (9). Such a culture then does not guarantee that we are offered a "free" choice and he concludes that "free choice is largely a myth" (5). He adds:

> I argue that people throughout the affluent, mass-mediated world today may be as molded by the material and cultural supermarkets as by the state.... But this manipulation may be more gentle in its means than manipulation by the state: a manipulation more of seduction than coercion, of the blandishments of advertising rather than the force of law. This manipulation has different meanings and implications depending on the degree of affluence of one's

---

one notices a willingness to create a permanent body of mass consumers promoting materialism and self-absorption into smaller and smaller social "units", such that "the high growth period of the 1960s prepared the way for a further 'micro-ization' of the nuclear family into constituent monads (individuals) has already occurred" (qtd. in Strecher 36).

> society and self—those who are affluent and plugged into media may have more room for choice than those who are not. (9-10)

Nevertheless, Mathews keeps the hope that there still is a space, where people can formulate a sense of cultural identity, independently of social homogeneity and postmodern diversity. As he states: "We are not slaves to the world around us, but have (in a social if not a philosophical sense) a certain degree of freedom in choosing who we are. This freedom may be highly limited, but it cannot be altogether denied" (23). Likewise, Mike Featherstone's *Consumer Culture & Postmodernism* (1991) insists on the individual's ability to formulate one's own style and personality in everyday life.

Murakami' novel develops a similar point of view. When the protagonist decides to stay in his own fantastic world, he negates both of the worlds in the two narratives. Rejection of these two worlds suggests that the protagonist seeks to fined something which has not yet attained. He claims: "Genius or fool, you don't live in the world alone. You can hide underground or you can build a wall around yourself, but somebody's going to come along and screw up the works" (*HWEW* 210). Facing up to oneself does not mean to be content with an apolitical life. On the contrary, his search for something missing accompanies an acute consciousness of one's responsibility. As far as we are unable to grasp the world except through its chaos, what is required of each of us is that we face ourselves as agents constituting a part of the world.

"I want to reconstruct a morality for this new world, this economic world. My generation, we are in a way disappointed, but we have to survive, we have to survive in this society, so we have to establish a new morality", Murakami maintains (*UN* 41). Consequently, we may notice that Murakami's novel has some affinity with the traditional Japanese literature as represented by Oe. Both writers are highly conscious of Japan's history and of its future. Murakami's use of Japanese language with plain style is based on the belief that Japan should avoid the repetition of the narrow-minded nationalism and imperialism of the first part of the twentieth century. He is worried about Japan's geographic and cultural isolation, which could lead to a

renewal of former ideologies. To avoid repeating the same mistakes of the past, he rejects the "beautiful Japanese" that traditional major writers, such as Mishima Yukio and Kawabata Yasunari (who is the first Japanese Nobel laureate), have always favoured. He aims to create a language easily accessible to the greatest number of readers. Therefore, Murakami rejects the idea that contemporary Japanese literature is in decline; he rather insists that Japan is experiencing a cultural transformation (1992: 209). As opposed to Oe's criticism against the young intellectuals' way of life, Murakami's novel portrays those who try to find a meaning and possibility of negotiating the consumer culture of late capitalism, which is becoming the dominant and unavoidable life-style on a global scale.

In *Hard-boiled Wonderland and End of the World*, utopia is downsized and personalised in the sense that the novel manifests a wish to "rediscover particularity, localism, and difference". In this sense, his novel is a postmodern work, which implies no aspiration to construct grand theories. The rediscovery of the individual connects subjectivity to the idea of a "global village". Utopia is both of a reduced scale and self-reflexive, but this does not mean that it is apolitical and escapist. The problem is that subjectivity itself becomes political. Hans Bertens' *The Idea of the Postmodern* argues that if "representations do not and cannot represent the world, then inevitably all representations are political, in that they cannot help reflecting the ideological frameworks within which they arise" (7). In other words, postmodernists must deal with the following political questions: "Whose history gets hold? In whose name? For what purpose?" (Marshall 1992: 4) The answer presented through Murakami's text is that it is the protagonist's history, in his name, and for his own sake. That is, history belongs to the individual. Matthew Strecher (1998) concludes that Murakami's achievement consists in "the subtle evocation of the politics of the postmodern era in texts which do not *seem* political in the least" (376). His novel suggests that working on the subjectivity of the individual is a political topic, and to consider the end of one's world is nothing less than to deal with the future of humankind, i.e. "the end of the world".

Conclusion

The main concern of this thesis has been to examine how six writers in the latter part of the twentieth century have embarked on creating utopian and dystopian novels in the face of postmodern consciousness.

The thesis starts with an analysis of George Orwell's last novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949), which paves the way for postmodern debates on the "end" of utopia. A monolithic and complete society, based on blind worship and austerity, is presented as the gloomy consequence of the human dream of the perfectly ideal society over the centuries. In this sense, dystopia is the negative mirror of utopia, through which individuals lose their autonomy and freedom for the sake of the State's power. Being sceptical over utopia's tendency to construct a monolithic and complete social and political system, the author sees through the similarity between totalitarianism and such classic utopian literature. Orwell anticipates the postmodernists' critical approach towards traditional utopian novels. Under postmodern consciousness, the totalitarian society is considered to be the consequence of modernity, namely the effect of the human ambition to construct a rationally perfect society. *Nineteen Eighty-Four* demonstrates the illusion of defining utopia, whose main result is to lead to an authoritarian world devoid of hope, imagination, and subjectivity. Showing the fear against any dominating forces which can be harmful to the notion of individuality, the novel conveys one powerful "moral": "*Don't let it happen. It depends on you*". Yet, this message paradoxically restricts the reader's interpretation of the text, and both his language and his depiction of the characters witness the idea of a totality and system transpired from his own work. The Appendix of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* shows how strongly Orwell believes that such terms as "democracy" and "freedom" infer universal and transcendental values which must be shared by the whole humankind. Moreover, the carefully and deliberately designed structure of the novel leaves no space for difference and diversity in our act of reading. His text still implies a strong sense of authorship and a didactic purpose; both being the main features of traditional utopia.

Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* portrays two dystopias: first, the world ruled by violent youths; second, the world governed by the State which conspires with scientists of aversion therapy. Thus, the juxtaposition of these undesirable worlds illustrates a conflict between the individual and the State order. Yet Burgess's text is different from Orwell's text in that Burgess places less emphasis on the sense of totality. In this novel, we see the absence of a central authoritarian figure, in the form of a Big Brother, which in consequence increases the extent of uncertainty and indeterminacy for the reader. In this sense, the conflict between Alex and the government lacks a feature of conventional dystopian literature; for, in this text, the presentation of a terrifying world does not only aim to give a warning to prevent the readers from reaching the horrible nightmare. The main protagonist in conventional dystopian texts is a dissident, who embodies the reader's conscience and morality. However, Burgess's protagonist does not play such a role. Alex is a violent individual, whose crimes are certainly unacceptable, even though he makes acute criticisms of the adults' passivity and the contradictions of the discourses of the dominant institutions (such as school and government). Likewise, the "utopian" society that the politicians and the scientists aim to construct is not very different from Alex's former world in terms of its violent intervention. *A Clockwork Orange* presents these undesirable worlds. While Orwell suggests a clear-cut moral message, Burgess provokes a sense of uncertainty insofar as no characters in his text evoke the belief in a sound and better world, and this is developed by Kubrick.

Alasdair Gray's *Lanark* offers a new prospect for utopian literature because of its postmodern and Scottish characteristics. Gray's novel suggests that dystopia is no longer an imaginative "somewhere" but an actual place, namely, Glasgow. Gray portrays the dire social conditions of this city and then illuminates the main protagonist's wish for an escape; yet, the dream for utopia is unreachable. Hence Gray's dystopia is illustrated as the challenging condition for the protagonist, whose dream for the place of comfort is always distracted and *deferred*. The numerous frustrating repetitions and failures the protagonist faces infer that the author is

interested in depicting the process in which the protagonist is reaching maturity. By the same token, the author creates artistic devices to illustrate the individual's consciousness as the vital factor. The illogical order of the narrative, the dialogue between the protagonist and the author-like figure, and the detailed footnotes, show that no perfect social vision can be suggested by the author. Gray deliberately avoids completing his work, and his readers are left with their own imagined interpretations; the complexity and fragmentation of the text implies that it is the reader's initiative and comprehension that can construct the novel as a whole. What *Lanark* provides us with is the difficulty of reaching utopia, but the novel also inspires the hope that each individual is certainly capable of dreaming and constructing a better world.

The thesis has presented three British novels which picture three kinds of dystopias: Orwell's is traditional one, Burgess's is uncertain one, and Gray's is postmodern one which is more concerned with the local and personal issues. Reading these texts, we see that they all show radicalised satires of contemporary worlds. Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* produces the satire of a totalitarian society, while Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange* includes the satire of a government which fight against the youth's irrational violence through science and authority's rational violence. Likewise, Gray's *Lanark* evokes a satire of Glasgow through his portrayal of the working class's suffering in dire social conditions. These three dystopias depict the conflict between the individual and the society, inferring that a logic of collectivity is a crucial issue for considering individuality and subjectivity. Gray's postmodern sensibility constitutes an interesting transition to a new era of utopian literature. As yet, these three British novelists have not explored a dynamic change in their consciousness and thus seem to find a certain difficulty in seeking a new logic of collectivity.

In contrast, the three Japanese utopian novels that the thesis has carefully examined provide a new path for the renewal of utopian literature. After Japan's discovery of utopia at the end of the nineteenth century, Japanese writers have developed this literary genre in their own ways. The history of Japanese utopian literature is a good model to show Japan's "malleable" nature, meaning that once

ideas are introduced from oversease, they are subsequently deconstructed and extended in accordance with Japan's regional context. When the end of the Second World War witnessed a drastic change in the life and the consciousness of the Japanese society, post-war writers created utopian and dystopian novels to reflect upon the horrendous events of the war. The novelist Kenzaburo Oe writes (1988):

> Japan's [modernisation] beginning with the Meiji Restoration had run into a fatal impasse—namely, the Pacific War—and culminated in defeat. Upon very sincere reflection, the Japanese searched for various principles to guide them in making a fresh, new start, and the aim of the postwar writers was to provide literary conviction and expression of such principles. (367)

Writers in the post-war Japan denounce the Meiji period's utopian literature which endorsed the political ideology of the central power. The collapse of this rigid social system enables them to be critical, subversive, nomad, and less politically and socially concerned. Thus, the three Japanese authors, discussed in this thesis, demonstrate the possibility of creating new conceptions of utopia, which are not based on the traditional confrontation of an individual's subjectivity with a collective system. In this, the three novels embark on more dynamic and flexible project in their treatment of new logic of collectivity.

From the view of the "nomad", Abe Kobo's *Inter Ice Age 4* paints the future lived by the aquans, the quasi-human creatures living under the sea. Abe argues through the novel that the new logic of collectivity must be something beyond our imagination and, therefore, a possible image of the future must be accepted as being irrelevant to our sense of continuity in the everyday. In this respect, Abe may be said to have a certain affinity with postmodern sensibility, as his text rejects the conception of history as a linear movement. Whereas traditional utopias prioritise the whole at the expense of individuals, Abe reverses this way of thinking and argues how the individual's nullified attitude towards everyday life helps construct the world of totality. The incredible future as presented by the computer asks us to what extent we can face the future which is beyond our imagination; such a question is connected to his own approach to everyday life.

Inoue Hisashi's *Kirikirijin* creates a downsized, egalitarian, and agrarian utopia. He presents a small utopian community, which has been marginalised through Japan's economic development. His detailed and concrete representation of utopia shares postmodern interest in the idea of the local and difference. *Kirikirijin* illustrates the possibility of defining small histories replacing the grand history, whose official narratives reject the particular truths proper to small communities.

Finally, we have seen Murakami Haruki's *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World.* The novel explores utopia through the individual's consciousness in the age of late capitalism. In this novel, utopia does not derive from a social practice, but is depicted as a spiritual fortress that the protagonist constructs in order to protect himself against a complex and chaotic world. In its fantastic mode, Murakami's novel defines its preference for a private world, i.e. a place confined to the individual's inner world. Yet, this does not mean that this private world means to be necessarily apolitical and escapist. Rather, Murakami argues that facing one's own mind and habits constitutes the first step to understand the complexity of the world surrounding us. As such, utopia does not rest on the confrontation between collective society and individual beings, since it is a subjective place confined to the mind, and is now only the place where one can find the clue to develop a new logic of collectivity.

The analysis of these three Japanese novels suggests that they explore new definitions of utopia.[1] We deal with three distinct utopias: Abe pictures a new global world devoid of national borders, Inoue reduces utopia to the local, and Murakami defines utopia as a fictive place in the mind. Yet, all have a common aim; these three Japanese texts imply that there still remain some possibilities of developing this literary genre. This demonstrates that utopian literature is not dead. [2] From this point

---

[1] About the necessity of dealing with comparative studies, Strecher writes: "Scholars of Japanese literature can no longer afford to ignore the fact that their subject is crossing its national boundaries, maturing into something which can no longer be isolated and protected from outside influences. As Japanese literary expressions come more and more to resemble their counterparts throughout the world, one sees the need to read on a global scale, to understand these new authors not as 'Japanese writers' but as *world* writers 'who happen to be Japanese'" (1995: 13-14).

[2] Tom Moylan (2000) writes that despite the difficulties in generating utopia, he still believes that "there *can* be utopian expressions that constantly shatter the present achievements and

of view, it can be considered that imagination becomes the key word, as stressed by Richard Kearney in *The Wake of Imagination* (2001):

> But deprived of the invigorating humanist ideologies of universal advancement and emancipation, how can postmodernism allow for the imagining of meaningful social and cultural actions committed to the [realisation] of a more just world? Once made aware of *both* our immense responsibility as individuals *and* our dispersion into a collective network of multiple communications, how are we to find our way? What kind of imagination can be solicited by a postmodern conscience confronting the end of modernity and grappling with its inner and ostensibly terminal crises? Where do we go from here? These are some of the key questions which motivate our inquiry into the wake of imagination. (28)

Imagination is the only place in which utopia can flourish, insofar as postmodern consciousness rejects the rational idea of a utopian society located in space and time. Hence, the postmodern aspect of utopia is irrevocably related to fantasy, as witnessed in Murakami's and Gray's novels. The individual's imagination is the only domain in which utopia can escape rationality, and as such, can avoid the anti-rational criticisms from postmodernism. The immediate consequence is that utopia must be conceived of as downsized and personalised, such that its central themes are concerned with personal issues and no longer social practices. This is compatible with the postmodern negations of central authority and ideological discourses. To locate utopia in the individual's sphere means that it is no longer the central purpose to universalise a utopian model. Thus, personal feelings, such as hubris, love, anger, desperation, or sympathy, are deemed to be the core of creating utopia in the contemporary world.[3]

A downsized and personalised utopia is the response to postmodern sensibility. According to Darko Suvin (1987), contemporary utopia and dystopia require "a more mature polyphony envisaging different possibilities for different agents and circumstances" (83). My study of the six novels shows that this literary genre is well

---

components of society and point to that which is not yet experienced in the human project of [fulfilment] and creation" (28).

[3] Cf. C.A. van Peursen in *Na het postmodernisme: van metafysica tot filosofisch surrealisme* (1994).

alive; one of the most important driving forces to maintain utopian thought and its literature is what Ernst Bloch terms "the not-yet-become" (the *noch-nicht-geworden*) and "the not-yet-conscious" (the *noch-nicht-bewusst*). To Bloch, literature and art embrace the anticipatory illumination of that which has not yet become. In other words, we must constantly search through our imagination for "something missing". Following Fredric Jameson and Louis Marin, we must be aware of a "rupture", an unknown place we are asked to find within ourselves. Therefore, utopia signifies its value through this gap, i.e. "the phantom spatial superposition" of our imagination with reality (Jameson, "Of Island and Trenches" 85). This argument is resonant with Herbert Marcuse's *One Dimensional Man* (1964), which defines art "as the bearer of utopia", meaning that art offers "only a glimpse of a utopia which is unattainable" (qtd. in Levitas 1990: 262). The expression of "the not-yet-conscious" restores the power of utopian literature, even though this latter is incompatible with traditional utopia whose central postulate was rationality and completeness. Postmodernism establishes uncertainty as the principle, through which utopia can flourish. Readers must accept that their questions will not be answered by the author and also that their own subjectivity will be preserved through the lack of final, rational, totalising conclusions. Such a hermeneutic practice pertains to a thriving consciousness which escapes the debilitating reality, and this constitutes the *raison d'être* of contemporary utopia. We must then remind ourselves that "utopia" means both "a good-place" (*eu-topos*) and "a no-place" (*ou-topos*). Although it is no longer possible to believe in a universal, ideal vision applicable to the whole humankind, utopia is still definable as the consciousness that something has yet to become known.

Appendix

As mentioned in Chapter II, there are two versions of Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*: the British version with the last chapter, Chapter 21, and the American version without the final chapter. The two different endings in the British and the American versions are adopted in Burgess's play adaptation (1987, 2000) and in Stanley Kubrick's film (1972) respectively. These two endings suggest that the meaning of the text is open, since they destabilise the power of the author and provokes various interpretations. Given the writer's and the film director's different motivations, theoretically and structurally, the play and the film imply some unknown spaces of the novel and develop the depth and complexity of it.

The whole structure of the play is carefully designed in order to satisfy Burgess's main concern. While the original novel is comprised of three parts, the play consists of two acts and develops all the ideas about human freedom in Act 1. In this Act, the conflict between opposing ideologies is highlighted. On the one hand, the necessity of repressing the violent gang is asserted through the voices of institutional powers, such as the school. On the other hand, the chaplain of the prison refutes this argument as humanless and rather tries to value the individual uniqueness. Thus, the chaplain positively assesses Alex's taste of music, saying, "The music you chose was, as always admirable. Taste is a great thing. It leads one to the beautiful, and beauty, with truth and goodness, is one of the attributes of God" (35). The chaplain's respect for individual autonomy is opposed to the government's policy which prioritises the reduction of crime rates and justifies any means for this end. The government states that punishment is no longer effective and that science and technology must be used for the improvement of the status quo. Dr Brodsky is the radicalised figure promoting aversion therapy. He holds that gaining freedom is meaningless because human beings must be treated in the same way as other animals. The scientist zealously asserts:

> "How like a god" said Hamlet of humankind. Better to say "How like a

> dog". A dog, as Pavlov showed, can at least be conditioned by the control of its reflexes into behaving like a harmless machine. If mankind is to be saved, science must take over. Science must dig its way into the human brain, crushing the instinct of aggression.... (51)

Act 1 ends with this defence of behaviourism accompanied with Beethoven's Ninth Symphony. In this play adaptation, Burgess adds the degree of accuracy in each character's role of representing an ideological stance.

Act 2 poses a question whether the new scientific treatment is reasonable. Again all main characters on the stage represent different ideologies, such as religion, science, politics and political dissidence. The chaplain denounces the so-called "Reclamation Treatment" because of the loss of free choice: "Choice. He [Alex] has no real choice, has he? He ceases to be a wrongdoer. He ceases also to be a creature capable of moral choice" (58). On the contrary, Dr Brodsky and the Minister reply: "These are subtleties. We are not concerned with motive, with the higher ethics. We are concerned only with cutting down crime.... And with relieving the ghastly congestion in our prisons" (58). Moreover, the state order is overtly criticised by two additional characters that do not exist in the novel, namely Dolin and Da Silva. They address the crowd through loudspeakers by saying that Alex is a victim of the Criminal Reform Scheme. They are immediately arrested and beaten by the riot police (78).

The play's focus on ideologies is illustrated by Burgess's rendition of the political dissident, Mr F. Alexander. Compared to the novel, the play version inserts extra arguments that to become "clockwork orange" means to be transformed into something like a robot, implying the deprivation of human freedom and emotions. All institutional powers are illustrated as a menace to the individual, as Burgess adds a scene in the play in which the chaplain tells Alex in his dream that he is completely sick of witnessing the conspiracy of politics and religion (79).

Likewise, Burgess's play is slightly different from the novel in its ending. The play more overtly reflects the necessity of Chapter 21. The Korovo Milk Bar is again set up on the stage, where three new gangs and Alex are sitting. The oldness of Alex

is highlighted in contrast to the gangs in new fashion. Their language also implies that Alex's *nadsad* is now out of fashion. Then Alex finds himself getting "tired" and also realises that something has changed in his mind:

> What was the matter with me these days I could not pony. O my brothers. It was like something soft getting into me—even the music I liked to slooshy was more like what they call Lieder, just a goloss and a piano, very quiet and like yearny.... There was something happening inside me.... (87)

Eventually, Alex becomes conscious of his age and his social role as an adult. Burgess deliberately puts the accent, more strongly than in the novel, on the fact that the protagonist's experience is something typical of the youth, which is a mere transition from childhood's state of dependence to the adult's world of responsibilities. Alex on the stage goes on to say:

> Youth must go, ah yes. But youth is only being in a way like it might be an animal.... No, it's more like being one of those malenky toys you viddy being sold in the street, made out of tin with a spring inside and a handle... That's being young.... And I look to the future and a son of my own who'll make the same like mistakes as I did just because he'll be young too. (89)

In both the novel and the play, Chapter 21 focuses on the issue that Alex's maturity is the natural conclusion to human will. At the end of the play, the lyrics of the chorus summarises Burgess's work:

> Do not be a clockwork orange.
> Freedom has a lovely voice.
> Here is good, and there is evil—
> Look on both, then take your choice.
> Sweet in juice and hue and aroma,
> Let's not be changed to fruit machines.
> Choice is free but seldom easy—
> That's what human freedom means! (90-1)

Bibliography

Primary Fictional Works

Abe, Kobo. *Daiyon kampyoki.* [*Inter Ice Age 4.*] Trans. E. Dale Saunders. 1959. Tokyo: C. E. Tuttle, 1970.

Burgess, Anthony. *A Clockwork Orange.* London: Penguin, 1962.

Gray, Alasdair. *Lanark: A Life in 4 Books.* 1981. London: Picador, 1994.

Inoue, Hisashi. *Kirikirijin.* Tokyo: Shinchosha, 1981.

Murakami, Haruki. *Sekai no owari to hadoboirudo wandarando.* [*Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World: A Novel.*] Trans. Alfred Birnbaum. 1985. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four.* 1947. London: Secker & Warburg, 1998.

General Bibliography

Abe. Masao. "Critical Reflections on the Traditional Japanese View of Truth". Wei-hsu Fu and Heine 297-312.

Adorno. Theodor W. *Prismen.* [*Prisms.*] Trans. Samuel and Shierry Weber. London: Neville Spearman. 1967.

Aldridge. Alexandra. "Origins of Dystopia: *When the Sleeper Wakes* and *We*". In *Clockwork Worlds: Mechanized Environments in SF.* Ed. Richard D. Erich and Thomas P. Dunn. Westport. CT: Greenwood Press. 1983. 63-84.

---. "Imagining Alternative Futures: The Polarities of Contemporary Utopian Thought". *Journal of General Education Issue* 37.1 (1987): 80-89.

Aldridge. Alfred Owen. "Utopianism in World Literature". *Tamkang Review: A Quarterly of Comparative Studies between Chinese and Foreign Literatures* 14.1-4 (Autumn-Summer 1983-84): 11-29.

---. "Utopianism in World Literature". *The Reemergence of World Literature: A Study of Asia and the West.* Ed. Masayuki Akiyama. Tokyo: Nanundo. 1985. 161-205.

Alexander. Bryan N. "Jameson's Adorno and the Problem of Utopia". *Utopian Studies* 9.2 (1998): 51-57.

Alkon. Paul. Roger Gaillard. Daniele Chatelain. and George Slusser. ed. *Transformation of Utopia: Changing Views of Perfect Society.* New York: AMS Press. 1999.

Althusser. Louis. *Politics and History: Montesquieu. Rousseau. Hegel and Marx.* Trans. Ben Brewster. London: NLB. 1972.

Anderson. Benedict. *Imagined Communities.* Rev. ed. London: Verso. 1991.

Anderson. Perry. "The River of Time". *New Left Review* 26 (March and April 2004): 67-77.

Apter. David E.. and Nagayo Sawa. *Against the State: Politics and Social Protest in Japan.* Cambridge. Mass.: Harvard UP. 1984.

Appadurai. Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalisation.* Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P. 1996.

Apter. T.E. *Fantasy Literature: An Approach to Reality.* London: Macmillan. 1982.

Arendt. Hannah. *The Origins of Totalitarianism.* 2nd. ed. Cleveland: World Publishing. 1961.

---. *The Burden or Our Time.* London: Secker & Warburg. 1951.

---. *Between Past and Future.* 1961. New York: Penguin. 1993.

. *Art in Modern Culture: An Anthology of Critical Texts.* Ed. Francis Frascina and Jonathan Harris. London: Phaidon. 1992.

Bailey, Jackson H. *Ordinary People, Extraordinary Lives: Political and Economic Change in a Tohoku Village*. Honolulu: U of Hawaii P, 1991.
Baker-Smith, Dominic, and C. C. Barfoot, ed. *Between Dream and Nature: Essays on Utopia and Dystopia*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1987.
Baker-Smith, Dominic, ed. "Utopia and Dystopia". *Dutch Quarterly Review of Anglo American Letters* 15.2 (1985)
Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Epic and Novel" (1941), "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel" (1937-8). *The Dialogic Imagination.* Trans. M. Holquist and C. Amerson. Austin: U of Texas Press, 1981.
---. *Rabelais and His World.* Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. 1965. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.
Balibar, Etienne, and Immanuel Wallerstein. *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*. 1988. London: Verso, 1991.
Barker, Chris. *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage, 2000.
Barshay, Andrew E. "Imagining Democracy in Postwar Japan: Reflections on Maruyama Masao and Modernism". *Journal of Japanese Studies* 18.2 (Summer 1992): 365-406.
Barthes, Roland. *Image-Music-Text.* Trans. Stephen Heath. Glasgow: 1977.
---. *Theory of the Text*. Trans. Ian McLeod. Young Robert, 1981.
—. *The Responsibility of Forms: Critical Essays in Music, Art, and Representation.* Trans. Richard Howard. Barkeley and Los Angeles: U of California P, 1991.
---. *L'empire des singes.* Trans. Sakon Soh. 1970. Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1999.
Bassnet, Susan. *Comparative Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
Baudrillard, Jean. "The Ecstasy of Communication." Ed. Hal Foster. *Postmodern Culture.* London: Pluto Press, 1983. 126-134.
---. *Simulacra and Simulation*. Trans. Sheila F. Glaser. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1994.
Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1989.
---. *Intimations of Postmodernity.* London and New York: Routledge, 1992.
Beasley, W. G. *The Japanese Experience: A Short History of Japan*. 1999. London: Phoenix, 2000.
Befu, Harumi and Sylvie Guichard-Anguis, ed. *Globalizing Japan: Ethnography of the Japanese Presence in Asia, Europe and America.* London and New York: Routledge, 2001.
Bell, Daniel. *The End of Ideology: On the Political Exhaustion of Political Ideas in the Fifties.* New York: Free Press, 1960.
Benjamin, Walter. *Illuminations.* Ed. Hannah Arendt. Trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken Book, 1969.
---. *Reflections: Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings.* Trans. Edmund Jephcott. New York: Schocken Books, 1978.
---. *Selected Writings.* Ed. Michael W. Jennings. 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 1999.
Benzaquén, Adriana S. "Thought and Utopia in the Writings of Adorno, Horkheimer, And Benjamin". *Utopian Studies* 9.2 (1998): 149-61.
Bergonzi, Bernard. *The Situation of the Novel.* London: Macmillan, 1970.
Berlin, Isaiah. *The Hedgehog and the Fox: An Essay on Tolstoy's View of History.* London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1953.
—. *The Crooked Timber of Humanity: Chapters in the History of Ideas*. Ed. Henry Hardy. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1959.
Bernheimer, Charles, ed. *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*. Baltimore and London: the Johns Hopkins UP, 1995.
Bertens, Hans. *The Idea of the Postmodern: A History.* London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

Bird, Isabella. *Unbeaten Tracks in Japan*. 1880. London: Virago, 1984.
Birnbaum, Alfred. *Monkey Brain Sushi: New Taste in Japanese Fiction*. Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1991.
Bloch, Ernst. *The Principle of Hope*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
---. *The Utopian Function of Art and Literature*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1988.
---. "Something's Missing: A Discussion Between Ernst Bloch and Theodor W. Adorno on the Contradictions of Utopian Longing". *Utopian Function of Art and Literature*. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1997.
---. *The Spirit of Utopia*. Trans. Anthony A. Nassar. 1964. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2000.
Bloch, Ernst. *The Spirit of Utopia*. Trans. Anthony A. Nassar. 1964. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2000.
Blocker, H. Gene, and Christopher I. Starling. *Japanese Philosophy*. New York: State U of New York P, 2001.
Booker, Keith M. *Dystopian Literature: A Theory and Research Guide*. Westport: Greenwood P, 1994.
---. *The Dystopian Impulse in Modern Literature: Fiction as Social Criticism*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1994.
Bourdieu, Pierre. "Distinction" Rivkin and Ryan 1029-36.
Bossert, Rex Thomas. *Oneiric Architecture: A Study in the Ideology of Modern Utopian Fiction*. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1994.
Bowlt, John E. "Utopia Revisited". *Art in America* 81.5 (May 1993): 98-104.
Bowring, Richard, and Peter Kornicki, ed. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.
Boyne, Roy. "The Art of the Body in the Discourse of Postmodernity". *Theory, Culture & Society* 5 (1988): 527-42.
Bradbury, Malcolm, and James McFarlane, ed. *Modernism*. London: Penguin, 1991.
Brecht, Bertolt. *Brecht on Theatre*. London: Eyre Methuen, 1973.
Britsch, Todd A. "History and the Future". *Alternative Futures* 3.3 (Summer 1980): 46-54.
Buber, M. *Paths in Utopia*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1949.
Buchanan, Ian. "Metacommentary on Utopia, or Jameson's Dialectic of Hope". *Utopian Studies* 9.2 (1998): 18-30.
Burns, Robert M., and Hugh Rayment-Pickard, ed. *Philosophies of History*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.
Butler, Christopher. *Interpretation, Deconstruction, and Ideology*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.
Cahoone, Lawrence, ed. *From Modernism to Postmodernism: An Anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
Callinicos, Alex. *Against Postmodernism*. 1989. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002.
Calinescu, Matei, and Douwe Fokkema, ed. *Exploring Postmodernism*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1990.
Campbell, Sue. "A Singular and Representative Life: Personal Memory and Systematic Harms". *Civilization and Oppression*. Ed. Catherine Wilson. Calgary: U of Calgary P, 1999. 227-257.
Carey, John, ed. *Utopias*. London: Faber and Faber, 1999.
Chang, Hui-chuan. "The Chinese Utopia: Problems and Visions". *The Force of Vision: Proceedings of the 13th Congress of the International Comparative Association*. Ed. Margaret R. Higonnet and Sumie Jones. 6 vols. Tokyo: Tokyo UP, 1995. 2: 225-233.
Chevrel, Yves. *Comparative Literature Today*. Trans. Farida E. Dahab. Missouri: Thomas Jefferson UP, 1995.
Chomsky, Noam. *Language and Politics*. Ed. C. P. Otero. Montreal: Black Rose

Books, 1988.
---. *Powers and Prospects*. 1996. Reprinted. London: Pluto Press, 1997.
Christian, Marouby. "*Utopian Colonialism*". *North Dakoda Quarterly* 56.3 (Summer 1988): 148-60.
Classe, Olive, ed. *Encyclopedia of Literay Translation into English*. London & Chicago: Fitzroy Dearbon, 2000. 2 vols.
Clark, Gordon L., Dean Forbes, and Roderick Francis. *Multiculturalism, Difference and Postmodernism*. Sydney: Longman Cheshire, 1993.
Clarke, Peter. *Hope and Glory: Britain 1900-1990*. London: Penguin, 1996.
Clute, John, and Peter Nicholls, ed. *The Encyclopedia of Science Fiction*. London: Orbit, 1993.
Cohn, Joel R. *Studies in the Comic Spirit in Modern Japanese Fiction*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 1998.
Cortazzi G. C. M. G., Sir Hugh. "British Influence in Japan since the End of the Occupation (1952-1984)". *Nissan Institution Occasional Paper Series* 13 (1990).
Cotton, William T. "The Eutopitect: Lewis Mumford as a Reluctant Utopian". *Utopian Studies* 8.1 (1997): 1-18.
Craig, Cairns. "Twentieth Century Scottish Literature: An Introduction". *The History of Scottish Literature: Twentieth Century*. Ed. Cairns Craig. 4 vols. Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1987. 4: 1-8.
---. *Out of History: Narrative Paradigms in Scottish and British Culture*. Edinburgh: Polygon, 1996.
---. *The Modern Scottish Fiction: Narrative and the National Imagination*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999.
Crossman, R.H.S. *Plato today*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1937.
Culler, Jonathan. *Literary Theory*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.
Cultural Studies and Communications. Ed. James Curran, David Morley and Valerie Walkerdine. London: Arnold, 1996.
Cunningham, Valentine. *In the Reading Gaol: Postmodernity, Texts and History*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1994.
Daiches, David, ed. *The New Companion to Scottish Culture*. Edinburgh: Polygon, 1993.
Dale, Peter N. *The Myth of Japanese Uniqueness*. London: Nissan Institute/Routledge, 1986.
Davis, D. C. *Utopia and the Ideal Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.
Davison, Donald. *Inquiries into Truth and Interpretation*. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1984.
Davy, John. "Dr. E. F. Schumacher: An Appreciation". *The Schumacher Lectures*. Ed. Satish Kumar. London: Abacus, 1982.
De Certeau, Michel. *The Writing of History*. Trans. Tom Conley. New York: Columbia UP, 1988.
---. The Practice of Everyday Life.
De Certeau, Michel, Luce Giard, Pierre Mayol. *The Practice of Everyday Life: Living & Cooking*. Volume 2. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1998.
De Jouvenel, Bertrand. "Utopia for Practical Purposes" Manuel 219-235.
Delany, Samuel R. "The Rhetoric of Sex, the Discourse of Desire". Siebers 229-272.
Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*. Trans. H. Tomlinson and B. Habberjam. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1986. (p9)
---. *Negotiations*. Trans. Martin Joughin. New York: Columbia UP, 1995.
Denith, Simon. *Parody*. London and New York: Routledge, 2000.
Derrida, Jacques. *Writing and Difference*. Trans. Alan Bass. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1978.
---. *A Derrida Reader: Between the Blinds*. Ed. Peggy Kamuf. New York: Columbia UP, 1991.

---. "Before the Law". *Acts of Literature*. Ed. Derek Attridge. New York and London: Routledge, 1992. 181-220.
Devine, T. M. *The Scottish Nation 1700-2000*. London: Penguin, 1999.
Dickson, Beth. "Foundations of the Modern Scottish Novel". Craig 1987: 49-60.
Docherty, Thomas, ed. *Postmodernism: A Reader*. 1993. New York and London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1999.
Doecke, Brenton. "Challenging History Making: Realism, Revolution and Utopia in *The Timeless Land*". *Australian Literary Studies*. 17.1 (1995): 49-57.
Donskis, Leonidas. *The End of Ideology and Utopia?* New York: Peter Lang, 2000.
Dower, John. *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Aftermath of World War II*. London: Penguin, 1999.
Dunn, Thomas P. "A Vision of Dystopia: Beehives and Mechanization". *Journal of General Education Issue* 37.1 (1987): 45-57.
Dupré, Louis. "The Idea of Historical Progress in Marx and Marxism". *Yale Review* 69.1 (October 1979): 33-42.
Eagleton, Terry. *Literary Theory*. 1983. Oxford: Blackwell, 1997.
---. *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso, 1991.
---. *The Illusions of Postmodernism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1996.
Eco, Umberto, V.V. Ivanov, and Monica Rector. *Carnival!* Ed. Thomas A. Sebeok. Berlin: Mouton, 1984.
Encyclopedia of Utopian Language. Ed. Snodgrass, Mary Ellen. ABC-Clio Literary Companion, 1995.
Ermarth, Elizabeth Deeds. *Sequel to History: Postmodernism and the Crisis of Representational Time*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1992.
Escher, M. C. *The Graphic Work of M. C. Escher*. Trans. John E. Brigham. 1960. London: Pan/Ballantine, 1972.
Ewen, Stuart. "All-Consuming Images: The Politics of Style in Contemporary Culture". Rivkin and Ryan 1083-86.
Faure, Bernard. "The Kyoto School and Reverse Orientalism". Wei-hsu Fu and Heine 245-281.
Featherstone, Mike. "In Pursuit of the Postmodern: An Introduction". *Theory, Culture & Society* 5.2-3 (June 1988): 195-215.
---. *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London: Sage, 1991.
Fischer, Roland. "A Story of the Utopian Vision of the World". *Diogenes* 163.41 (3) (1993): 5-25.
Fite, Warner. *The Platonic Legend*. New York and London: Charles Scriber's Son, 1934.
Fitting, Peter. "The Modern Anglo-American SF Novel: Utopian Longing and Capitalist Cooptation". Science-Fiction Studies. 6 (1979): 59-76.
---. "Positioning and Closure: On the 'Reading Effect' of Contemporary Utopian Fiction". *Utopian Studies* 1 (1987): 23-36.
---. "Utopian Effect/Utopian Pleasure". *Utopian Studies IV* (1991): 90-96.
Forster, E. M. *The Eternal Moment and Other Stories*. London: Sidgwick & Jackson, 1928.
---. *Two Cheers for Democracy*. 1951; London: Edward Arnold, 1972.
Foster, Hal. *Postmodern Culture*. London and Sydney: Pluto, 1985.
Fortunati, Vita. "'It Makes No Difference': A Utopia of Simulation and Transparency." *George Orwell's* 1984. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House, 1987. 109-120.
Fowler, Edward. *The Rhetoric of Confession: Shishosetsu in Early Twentieth-century Japanese Fiction*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1988.
---. "Rendering Words, Traversing Cultures: On the Art and Politics of Translating Modern Japanese Fiction". *Journal of Japanese Studies* 18.1 (Winter 1992).
Fowler, Roger, ed. *Language and Control*. London: Routledge, 1979.
Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of Human Sciences*. New

York: Pantheon Books, 1970.
---. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison.* 1977. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage, 1995.
---. "What is an Author?" *Language, Culture-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews.* Ed. Donald F. Bouchard. Trans. Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977.
---. *The History of Sexuality.* Trans. Robert Hurley. 1978. London: Penguin, 1981.
---. *Technologies of the Self.* Amherst: Massachusetts P, 1988.
---. *Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984.* Ed. James D. Faubion. 1994. London: Pengusin, 2000.
---. "The Birth of Social Medicine". *Power: Essential Works of Foucault* 134-156.
---. "The Risks of Security". *Power: Essential Works of Foucault* 365-381.
---. "Subject and Power". *Power: Essential Works of Foucault* 326-348.
Foust, R. E. "A Limited Perfection: Dystopia as Logos Game". *Mosaic: A Journal for the Interdisciplinary Study of Literature.* 15.3 (September 1982): 79-88.
Fujii, James A. *Complicit Fictions: The Subject in the Modern Japanese Prose Narrative.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1993.
Frankel, B. *The Post-Industrial Utopians.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987.
Frédéric, Louis. *Japan Encyclopedia.* Trans. Käthe Roth. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2002.
Friedman, Régine-Mihal. "Capitals of Sorrow: From *Metropolis* to *Brazil*". *Utopian Studies* 4.2 (1993): 35-43.
Frow, John. *Marxism and Literary History.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1986.
---. *Cultural Studies and Cultural Value.* 1995. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1996.
---. *Time and Commodity Culture: Essays in Cultural Theory and Postmodernity.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.
Frye, Northrop. "Varieties in Literary Utopias". *Utopias and Utopian Thought.* Ed. Frank E. Mannuel. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966. 25-49.
---. *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance.* Harvard UP.
Gao, Bai. *Economic Ideology and Japanese Industrial Policy: Developmentalism from 1931 to 1965.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
Galtseva, Renata, and Irina Rodnyanskaya. "The Obstacle: The Human Being, or the Twentieth Century in the Mirror of Dystopia". *South Atlantic Quarterly* 90.2 (Spring 1991): 293-322.
Gardiner, Michael. "Bakhtin's Carnival: Utopia as Critique". *Utopian Studies* 3.2 (1992): 21-49.
---. "A Postmodern Utopia? Heller and Fehér's Critique of Messianic Marxism". *Utopian Studies* 8.1 (1997): 89-122.
Gerber, Richard. "The English Island Myth: Remarks on the Englishness of Utopian Fiction". *Critical Quarterly* 1 (Spring 1959): 36-43.
Garret, J. C. *Utopias in Literature since the Romantic Period.* New Zealand: U of Canterbury, 1968.
Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity.* Cambridge: Polity P, 1990.
Gluck, Carol. "The 'Long Postwar': Japan and Germany in Common and in Contrast". Schlant and Rimer 63-78.
Goodwin, Barbara, and Keith Taylor. *The Politics of Utopia.* London: Hutchinson, 1982.
Goodman, Roger and Kirsten Refsing, eds. *Ideology and Practice in Modern Japan.* London: Nissan Institute/Routledge, 1992.
Gordon, Andrew, ed. *Postwar Japan as History.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1993.
Greimas, A.J. "Narrative Grammar: Units and Levels". *Modern Language Notes* 86 (1971): 793-806.
Greenblatt, Stephen. "Utopian Desire". *Litteraria-Pragensia: Studies in Literature and Culture* 2.4 (1992): 30-41.

Grossberg, Lawrence. "The Space of Culture, the Power of Space." *The Post-colonial Question.* Eds. Iain Chambers and Lidia Curti. London: Routledge, 1996. 169-188.
Habermas, Jürgen. "Modernity versus Postmodernity". *New German Critique* 22 (1981): 3-14.
---. *Die Moderne—ein unvollendetes Projekt.* 1981. Trans. Mishima Kenichi. Tokyo: Iwanami, 2000.
---. *Philosophical-Political Profiles.* Trans. Frederick G. Lawrence. London: Heinemann, 1983.
---. "Modernity's Consciousness of Time and Its Need for Self-Reassurance". *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures.* Trans. Frederick G. Lawrence. 1985. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990. 1-22.
Hannum, Hildegarde, ed. *People, Land, and Community.* New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1997.
Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory.* Ed. Trans. Lewis A. Coser. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 1992.
Hall, Stuart, David Held, and Tony McGrew ed. *Modernity and Its Futures.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993.
Harootunian, Harry. *History's Disquiet: Moernity, Cultural Practice, and the Question of Everyday Life.* New York: Columbia UP, 2000.
Harvy, David. "From Space to Place and Back Again: Reflections on the Condition of Postmodernity". *Mapping the Futures* 3-29.
Haschak, Paul G. *Utopian / Dystopian Literature: A Bibliography of Literary Criticism.* Metuchen: The Scarecrow P, 1994.
Hassan, Ihab. *Between the Eagle and the Sun: Traces of Japan.* Alabama: U of Alabama P, 1996.
Hawkes, David. *Ideology.* London: Routledge, 1996.
Hawkins, Harriett. *Strange Attractors: Literature, Culture and Chaos Theory.* New York: Prentice Hall, 1995.
Hayek, F. A. *The Road to Serfdom.* 1944. London: George Routledge & Sons, 1946.
Hebdige, Dick. *Subculture: The Meaning of Style.* London: Methuen, 1979.
---. "A Report on the Western Front: Postmodernism and the 'Politics' of Style". *Art in Modern Culture.* Eds. Francis Frascina and Jonathan Harris. London: Phaidon, 1992. 331-41.
---. *Hiding in the Light.* 1988. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.
---. "Fax to the Future". *Marxism Today* (January 1990): 18-23.
Heise, Ursula K. *Chronoschisms: Time, Narrative, and Postmodernism.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. *The Philosophy of History.* Trans. J. Sibree. New York: Dover Publications, 1956.
---. "Dialectics". Rivkin and Ryan. 243-246.
Heller, Agnes. *Everyday Life.* Trans. G.L. Campbell. 1970. London and New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984.
Hendry, Joy. *Understanding Japanese Society.* London: Nissan Institute/Routledge, 1995.
Heron, A.I.C. "Calvinism". *The New Companion to Scottish Culture.* Ed. David Daiches. Edinburgh: Polygon, 1993. 38-39.
Hertzler, J. D. *The History of Utopian Thought.* London: Allen and Unwin, 1922.
Highmore, Ben, ed. *The Everyday Life Reader.* London and New York: Routledge, 2002.
Hillegas, Mark. *Future as Nightmare: H. G. Wells and the Anti-Utopians.* 1967
Hodges, Donald Clark. "The End of the 'The End of Ideology'". *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 26.2 (1967): 135.
Holdheim, W. Wolfgang. *The Hermeneutic Mode: Essays on Time in Literature and*

Literary Theory. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984.
Hollinger, Veronica. "Utopia, Science, Postmodernism, and Feminism: A Trilogy of Significant Works". *Science Fiction Studies* 21.2 (July 1994): 232-37.
Horkheimer, Max and Theodor Adorno. *Dialectic of Enlightenment.* Trans. John Cumming. New York: Seabury, 1972.
Hoston, Germaine A. *Marxism and the Crisis of Development in Prewar Japan.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1986.
Howe, Irving. "The Fiction of Anti-Utopia". *The New Republic* 146 (April 23, 1962): 13-6.
Hughes, H. Stuart. "The End of Political Ideology". *Measure* 2.2 (1951): 146-158.
Hume, Kathryn. *Fantasy and Mimesis: Responses to Reality in Western Literature.* New York: Methuen, 1984.
Hunter, Janet E. *The Emergence of Modern Japan: An Introductory History Since 1853.* London and New York: Longman, 1989.
Huntington, John. "Utopian and Anti-Utopian Logic: H.G. Wells and his Successors". *Science-Fiction Studies* 9 (1982): 122-146.
Hutcheon, Linda. *The Politics of Postmodernism.* London: Routledge, 1989.
Huxley, Aldous. *Brave New World.* London: Flamingo, 1994.
Huyseen, Andreas. *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism.* Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1986.
---. "Monument and Memory in a Postmodern Age". *The Art in Memory: Holocaust Memorials in History.* Ed. James E. Young. Munich & New York: Prestel, 1994. 9-17.
Irwin, W. R. *The Game of the Impossible: A Rhetoric of Fantasy.* Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1976.
Jackson, Rosemary. *Fantasy: The Literature of Subversion.* London and New York: Methuen, 1981.
Jacobs, Naomi. "Islandia: Plotting Utopian Desire". *Utopian Studies* 6.2 (1995): 75-89.
Jacoby, Russell. *The End of Utopia.* New York: Basic Books, 1999.
Jameson, Fredric. *Marxism and Form.* Princeton, N. J.: Princeton UP, 1971.
---. "The Dialectic of Utopia and Ideology." *The Political Unconscious.* 1981; London: Routledge, 1996.
---. "Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism". *New Left Review* 146 (1984): 53-93.
---. "Postmodernism and Consumer Society" Postmodern Culture. Ed. Foster. London: 1985. 113-114.
---. "Of Islands and Trenches Neutralization and the Production of Utopian Discourse." Vol. 2 of *The Ideologies of Theory: Essays 1971-1986.* 2 vols. London: Routledge, 1988.
---. "The Dialectic of Utopia and Ideology." *The Political Unconscious.* 1981. London: Routledge, 1993.
---. "Progress versus Utopia: Or Can We Imagine the Future?" *Science Fiction Studies* 9.2 (July 1982): 122-146.
---. *The Seeds of Time.* New York: Columbia UP, 1994.
---. "Comments". *Utopian Studies* 9 (1998): 74-77.
Jameson, Fredric, and Masao Miyoshi, ed. *The Cultures of Globalization.* Durham and London: Duke UP, 1998.
Jansen, Marius B. *Changing Japanese Attitude towards Modernism.* New Jersey: Princeton P, 1969.
---. *The Making of Modern Japan.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP, 2002.
Jauss, Hans Robert. *Literaturgeschichte als Provokation.* 1970. Trans. Kutsuwada Osamu. Tokyo: Iwanami, 2001.
Kasza, Gregory J. *The Conscription Society: Administered Mass Organization.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1995.

Kateb, G. *Utopia and Its Enemies.* New York: Schocken Books, 1992.
Kato, Shuici. *A History of Japanese Literature: The Modern Years.* Vol. 3 of *A History of Japanese Literature.* Trans. Don Sanderson. 3 vols. London: Macmillan, 1983.
Kato, Shuichi. *A History of Japanese Literature: The Modern Years.* Vol. 3 of *A History of Japanese Literature.* Trans. Don Sanderson. 3 vols. London: Macmillan, 1983.
Kaufmann, M. *Utopias.* London: Kegan Paul, 1879.
Kavanagh, James H. "Ideology." *Critical Terms for Literary Study.* Eds. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1995.
Kawabata Kaori. *Utopia no Genso.* 1971. Tokyo: Kodansha, 1993.
Kawahara, Hiroshi. *Dento shiso to minshu.* Tokyo: Seibundo, 1987.
Kawai, Hayao. *The Japanese Psyche: Major Motifs in the Fairy Tales.* Dallas: Spring Publishers, 1988. Kaufmann, M. *Utopias.* London: Kegan Paul, 1879.
Kawakatsu, Heita. *Bunmei no kaiyoshikan.* 1997. Tokyo: Chuokoron-sha, 1998.
Keay, John, and Julia Keay, ed. *Collins Encyclopedia of Scotland.* London: Harper Collins, 1994.
Kelly, Catriona. *Utopias: Russian Modernist Texts 1905-1940s.* London: Penguin, 1999.
Kearny, Richard. *The Wake of Imagination.* 1988. London: Routledge, 2001.
Keene, Donald. *Japanese Literature: An Introduction for Western Readers.* 1955. Tokyo: C. E. Tuttle, 1977.
---. *The Japanese Discovery of Europe, 1720-1830.* Stanford: Stanford UP, 1969.
---. *World within Walls: Japanese Literature of the Pre-modern Era, 1600-1867.* New York: Columbia UP, 1999.
Kermode, Frank. *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction.* New York: Oxford UP, 1967.
---. "Secrets and Narrative Sequence". *On Narrative.* 79-97.
Kermode, Frank. *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction.* New York: Oxford UP, 1967.
---. "Freedom and Interpretation". *Yale Review* 81.1 (January 1993): 41-91.
Kersten, Rikki. "Diverging Discourse: Shimizu Ikutaro, Maruyama Masao and Post-War Tenko". *Nissan Institution Occasional Paper Series* 20 (1994).
---. *Democracy in Postwar Japan: Maruyama Masao and the Search for Autonomy.* (Nissan Institute/Routledge Japanese Studies.) London: Nissan Institute/ Routledge, 1996.
King, Roger J. H. "Utopian Fiction as Moral Philosophy; Imagination and Critique". *Utopian Studies III* (1991): 72-78.
Klawitter, Uwe. *The Theme of Totalitarianism in "English" Fiction.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997.
Knoll, Samson, B. "Form or Content?: Reflections on the Concept of Utopia in Asian and West European Thought". *Alternative Futures* 3.3 (1980): 3-14.
Kolakowski, Leszek. "The Death of Utopia Reconsidered". *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values.* Ed. S.M. McMurrin. IV (1983) Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1983.
Kornicki, P. F. , and I. J. McMullen. *Religion in Japan: Arrows to Heaven and Earth.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995.
Koschmann, J. Victor. *Revolution and Subjectivity in Postwar Japan.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.
Koster, Patricia. "Dystopia: An Eighteenth-Century Appearance." *Notes and Queries* 30 (228):1 (February 1983): 65-66.
Kreiner, Josef, ed. *The Impact of Traditional Thought in Present-Day Japan.* Munich: Iudicium Verlag/Philipp-Franz-von-Siebold-Stiftung Deutsches Institüt Fur Japanstudien, 1996.

Kristeva, Julia. *Desire in Language.* Trans. Thomas Gora, Alice Jardine and Leon S. Roudiez. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1980.
---. *Strangers to Ourselves.* Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991.
Kumar, Krishan. *Utopia and Anti-Utopia in Modern Times.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987.
---. *Utopianism.* Milton Keynes: Open UP, 1991.
---. *From Post-industrial to Post-modern Society.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1995.
Kumar, Satish, ed. *The Schumacher Lectures.* 2 vols. London: Abacus, 1982.
Lanin, Borris. "The Morphology of the Literary Anti-Utopia". *Essays in Poetics* 23 (Autumn 1998) : 44-56.
Lang, Fritz. *Metropolis.* Surrey: Lorrimer Publishing, 1973.
Leaman, Oliver. "Time, Modernity, and Destructive Habits of Thought." *Civilization and Oppression.* Ed. Catherine Wilson. Calgar: U of Calgary P, 1999. 127-146.
Lee, Alison. *Realism and Power: Postmodern British Fiction.* London: Routledge, 1990.
Levitas, Ruth. *The Concept of Utopia.* New York: Philip Allan, 1990.
---. "The Future of Thinking about the Future." *Mapping the Future* 257-266. Ed. Jon Bird, Barry Curtis, Tim Punam, George Robertson and Lisa Tickner. London: Routledge, 1992. 257-66.
Lin, Forest. "Utopias East and West: The Relationship between Ancient and Modern Chinese Ideals". *Alternative Futures* 3.3 (1980): 15-31.
Lodge, David. "Utopianism and Criticism." *Encounter* 32.4 (April 1969): 65-75.
---. *After Bakhtin*: Essays on Fiction and Criticism. London and New York: Routledge, 1990.
---. *The Art of Fiction.* London: Penguin, 1992.
Lukács, George. *The Theory of the Novel.* Trans. Anna Bostock. London: Merlin P, 1916.
Lury, Celia. "The United Colors of Diversity: Essential and Inessential Culture". *Global Nature, Global Culture.* Ed. Sarah Franklin, Celia Lury and Jackie Stacey. London: Sage, 2000. 146-187.
Lyotard, Jean- François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge.* Trans. Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. 1979. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1984.
---. "Answering the Question: What is Postmodernism?"/ "Note on the Meaning of 'Post-'." Docherty 38-46, 47-50.
Macdougall, Carl. *Writing Scotland.* Edinbugh: Polygon, 2004.
Macey, Samuel L. "The Role of Clocks and Time in Dystopias: Zamyatin's *We* and Huxley's *Brave New World.* Ueda 24-43.
Macmurray, John. *Persons in Relation.* Vol. 2 of *The Form of the Personal.* 1961; London: Faber, 1970.
Maeda, Ai. *Tekusuto no utopia.* Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo, 1990.
Malzahn, Manfred. "The Industrial Novel". Craig: 1987. 229-241.
Manlove, Colin. *Scottish Fantasy Literature: A Critical Survey.* Edinburgh: Canogate Acadmic, 1994.
Mannheim, Karl. *Ideology and Utopia.* London: Kegan Paul, 1940.
Manuel, Frank E., ed. *Utopias and Utopian Thought.* 1965. London: Souvenir Press, 1973.
---. "Toward a Psychological History of Utopia". Manuel 69-98.
Manuel, F. E. and F. P. *Utopian Thought in the Western World.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1979.
Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change. Ed. Jon Bird, Barry Curtis, Tim Punam, George Robertson and Lisa Tickner. London: Routledge, 1993.
Maraldo, John C. "Tradition, Textuality, and the Trans-lation of Philosophy: The Case of Japan". Wei-hsu Fu and Heine 225-243. Marcuse, Herbert. *Eros and Civilization.* New York: Vintage Books, 1955.
Marcuse, Herbert. *Eros and Civilization.* New York: Vintage Books, 1955.

---. *Five Lectures: Psychoanalysis, Politics, and Utopia.* Trans. Jeremy J. Shaprio and Shierry M. Weber. London: Allen Lane The Penguin P. 1970.
Marin, Louis. *Utopiques: jeux d'espaces*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit. 1973.
---. *Utopics: Spatial Play.* Trans. Robert A. Vollratj. London: Macmillan. 1984.
Markus, Thomas A. *Visions of Perfection: Architecture and Utopian Thought.* Glasgow: Third Eye Centre. 1985.
Martin, Jay. "Habermas and Postmodernism". *The Divided Heritage: Themes and Problems in German Modernism.* Ed. Irit Rogoff. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 1991. 75-85.
Marwick, Arthur. *British Society since 1945.* London: Penguin. 1996.
Maruyama, Masao. *Nihon no shiso.* 1961. Tokyo: Iwanami. 2001.
---. *Thought and Behaviour in Modern Japanese Politics.* Ed. Ivan Morris. 1963. London: Oxford UP. 1966. Rep.
Matthews, Gordon. *Global Culture Individual Identity.* London and New York: Routledge. 2000.
Matthew, Robert. *Japanese Science Fiction: A View of a Changing Society.* London: Routledge & Oxford. 1989.
McHale, Brian. *Postmodernist Fiction.* London: Methuen. 1987.
---. *Constructing Postmodernism.* London: Routledge. 1992.
Mclennan, Gregor. "The Enlightenment Project Revisited". *Modernity and Its Futures.* Ed. Stuart Hall. 328-355.
Mcveigh, Brian. *The Nature of the Japanese State: Rationality and Rituality.* London: Nissan Institute/Routledge. 1998.
Medina, Angel. *Reflection, Time, and the Novel.* London: Routledge. 1979.
Mendelsohn, Everett, and Helga Nowothy eds. *Nineteen Eighty-Four: Science between Utopia and Dystopia.* Dordrecht: Reidel. 1984.
Meyer, Birgit, and Peter Geschiere, ed. Globalization and Identity: Dialectics of Flow and Closure. Oxford: Blackwell. 1999.
Meyers, Walter E. *Aliens and Linguists: Language Study and Science Fiction.* Athens: U of Georgia P. 1980.
Michnik, Adam. "Gray Is Beautiful". *Dissent* (Spring 1997): 15-6.
Mita, Munesuke. *Social Psychology of Modern Japan.* London: Kegan Paul International. 1993.
Mitchell, W.J.T., ed. *On Narrative.* 1980. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P. 1981.
Mitsios, Helen, ed. *New Japanese Voices: The Best Contemporary Fiction from Japan.* New York: Atlantic Monthly P. 1991.
Miyoshi, Masao. *Off Center: Power and Culture Relations between Japan and the United States.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP. 1991.
---. *Japan in the World.* Durham: Duke UP. 1993.
Miyoshi, Masao and H. D. Harootunian, eds. *Postmodernism and Japan.* Durham: Duke UP. 1989.
Mizuta, Kazuo. *The Structure of Everyday Life in Japan in the Last Decade of the Twentieth-Century.* New York: Edwin Mellen P. 1993.
Moichi, Yoriko. "Japanese Utopian Literature from the 1870s to the Present and the Influence of Western Utopianism". *Utopian Studies.* 10.2 (1999): 89-97.
Morley, David. "Postmodernism: The Rough Guide". Ed. James Curran, David Morley, and Valerie Walkerdine. *Cultural Studies and Communications.* London: Arnold. 1996.
Morris, David B. "Postmodern Pain". Siebers 150-73.
Multicultural Japan: Palaeolithic to Postmodern. Eds. Donald Denoon, Mark Hudson, Gavan McCormack and Tessa Morris-Suzuki. Cambridge: Cambridge UP. 1996.
Morley, David, and Keven Robins. Spaces of Identity. 1995. London and New York:

Routledge, 1996.
Morris, David B. "Postmodern Pain". Siebers 150-173.
Morson, Gary Saul. *Boundaries of Genre.* Austin: U of Texas P, 1981.
Morton, Arthur Leslie. *The English Utopia.* London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1952.
Moylan, Tom. "The Locus of Hope: Utopia versus Ideology". *Science Fiction Studies* 9.2 (July 1982): 159-166.
---. *Demand the Impossible: Science Fiction and the Utopian Imagination.* New York: Methuen, 1986.
---. *Scraps of the Untainted Sky: Science Fiction, Utopia, Dystopia.* Colorado: Westview Press, 2000.
Muir, Edwin. *An Autobiography.* London: Hogarth Press, 1954.
---. *Scott and Scotland: The Predicament of the Scottish Writer.* Edwin: Polygon Books, 1982.
Mumford, Lewis. *The Story of Utopias.* 1922. New York: Viking P, 1974.
---. "Utopia, the City and the Machine". Manuel 3-24.
Musarra, Ulla. "Narrative Discourse in Postmodernist Texts: The Conventions of the Novel and the Multiplication of Narrative Instances". Calinescu 215-31.
Nagai, Michiko and Miguel Urrutia, eds. *Meiji Ishin: Restoration and Revolution.* Tokyo: The United Nations University, 1985.
Nairn, Tom. *The Break-up of Britain: Crisis and Neo-Nationalism.* Second, Expanded Edition. London: Verso, 1981.
Napier, Susan J. "Panic Sites: The Japanese Imagination of Disaster from *Godzilla* to *Akira*". *Journal of Japanese Studies* 19.2 (1993): 327-351.
---. *The Fantastic in Modern Japanese Literature.* London: Routledge, 1996.
Norris, Christopher. *Deconstruction: Theory and Practice.* 1982. Rev. ed. London: Routledge, 1991.
Nozick, Robert. *Anarchy, State and Utopia.* New York: Basic Books, 1974.
Nagano, Koji. "The Image of the City in Utopian Literature". *Language and Culture* 23 (1992): 95-113.
Negley, G., and J. M. Patrick. *The Quest for Utopia.* Maryland: McGrath, 1971.
Negley, Glenn Robert. *Utopian Literature: A Bibliography with a Supplementary Listing of Works Influential in Utopian Thought.* Lawrence: Regents Press of Kansas, 1977.
Nemoto, Reiko Tachibana. "On Two Interviews between Günter Grass and Oe Kenzaburo". *World Literature Today* 67.2 (Spring 1993): 301-305.
Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On Truth and Falsity in their Extra-moral Sense" (1873). *Friedrich Nietzsche; Philosophical Writings.* Ed. Reinhold Grimm and Caroline Molina y Vedia. Continuum N.Y.: 1995. 87-99.
---. *The Twilight of the Idols.* (1888) Trans. Duncan Large. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.
Nuita, Seiji. "Traditional Utopias in Japan and the West: A Study in Contrasts." *Aware of Utopia.* Ed. David W. Plath. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1971. 12-32.
Odagiri, Hiroyuki and Akira Goto. *Technology and Industrial Development in Japan.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.
Oe, Kenzaburo. *Sengo bungakusha.* (*Post-war Writers.*) Vol 6. *Oe Kenzaburo Dojidai-ronshu.* Tokyo: Iwanami, 1981.
---. *Sozoryoku to Jokyo.* (*Imagination and Situations.*) Vol 3. *Oe Kenzaburo Dojidai-ronshu.* Tokyo: Iwanami, 1981.
---. *Japan, the Ambiguous, and Myself: The Nobel Prize Speech and Other Lectures.* Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1995.
---. "Japan, the Dubious, and Myself". Wei-hsu Fu and Heine 313-325.
---. "Japan's Dual Identity: A Writer's Dilemma". *World Literature Today* 62.3 (Summer 1988): 359-69.
Olson, Lawrence. *Ambivalent Moderns: Portraits of Japanese Cultural Identity.*

Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1992.
Olson, Theodore. *Millennialism, Utopianism, and Progress.* Toronto: Toronto UP, 1982.
Ono, Jiro. *Yutopia no koso.* Tokyo: Shobun-sha, 1986.
Passmore, John. *The Perfectibility of Man.* London: Duckworth, 1970.
Penley, Constance. "Time, Travel, Primal Scene, and the Critical Dystopia." *Camera Obscura: A Journal of Feminism, Culture and Media Studies* 15 (Fall 1986): 66-85.
Peyser, Thomas. *Utopia & Cosmopolis.* Durham & London: Duke UP, 1998.
Perec, Georges. "Approaches to What?" Highmore 177-178.
Perren, Richard, comp. *Japanese Studies from Pre-History to 1990: A Bibliographical Guide.* Manchester: Manchester UP, 1992.
Philmus, Robert. "The Language of Utopia". *Studies in the Literary Imagination* (1973): 61-78.
Plath, David W., ed. *Aware of Utopia.* Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1971.
Polak, Frederik L. "Utopia and Cultural Renewal". Manuel 281-295.
Pollack, David. *Reading against Culture: Ideology and Narrative in the Japanese Novel.* Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1992.
Popper, Karl. *The Open Society and Its Enemies.* London: Routldge and Kegan Paul, 1945.
Raulet, Gérald. "360 Degree in Time: Postmodern Architecture and the Question of Consensus". *Utopian Studies* 4.2 (1993): 57-65.
Reszler, Andre. "Man as Nostalgia: The Image of the Last Man in Twentieth-Century Postutopian Fiction". Friedlander, Saul, Gerald Holton, Leo Marx, and Eugene Skolnikoff, eds. *Visions of Apocalypse: End or Rebirth?* New York: Holmes, 1985.
Rice, Philip and Patricia Waugh,eds. *Modern Literary Theory: A Reader.* 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold, 1992.
Richard, Rorty. "The Intellectuals at the End of Socialism". *Yale Review* 80. 1&2 (April 1992): 1-16.
Ricoeur, P. *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia.* New York: Columbia UP, 1986.
Rimer, J. Thomas, ed. *Culture and Identity: Japanese Intellectuals during the Interwar Years.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1990.
Rivkin, Julie and Michael Ryan. *Literary Theory: An Anthology.* Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1998.
Roberts, John. *Postmodernism, Politics and Art.* Manchester: Manchester UP, 1990.
Rorty, Richard. "The Contingency of Language". *London Review of Books* (17 April 1986): 3.
---. "The End of Lenisms and History as Comic Frame". *History and the Idea of Progress.* Ed. A. M. Melzer et al. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1995. 212-214.
Rose, Margaret. *Parody//Meta-fiction.* London: Croom Helm, 1979.
---. *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-modern.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.
Robbe-Grillet, Alain. *For a New Novel: Essays on Fiction.* Trans. Richard Howard. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern UP, 1963.
Roschmann, Victor J. "Intellectuals and Politics". *Postwar Japan as History.* Ed. Andrew Gordon. Berkeley: U of California P, 1993.
Rosenberger, Nancy, ed. *Japanese Sense of Self.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
Rozman, Gilbert. *The East Asian Region: Confucian Heritage and Its Modern Adaptation.* Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.
---. "Backdoor Japan: The Search for a Way Out via Regionalism and Decentralization". *Journal of Japanese Studies* 25.1 (Winter 1999): 3-32.
Ruppert, Peter. *Reader in Strange Land: The Activity of Reading Literary Utopia.* Athens and London: U of Georgia P, 1986.
Rutherford, Jonathan. "A Place Called Home: Identity and the Culture Politics of Difference." In *Identity, Community, Culture, Difference.* Ed. Jonathan Rutherford.

London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1990.
Said, Edward W. *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures.* London: Vintage, 1994.
Sapier, Edward. *Language: An Introduction to the Study of Speech.* New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1921.
Sargent, Lyman Tower. *British and American Utopian Literature, 1516-1985: An Annotated Chronological Bibliography.* New York: Garland, 1988.
---. "The Three Faces of Utopianism Revisited". *Utopian Studies* 5.1 (1994): 1-37.
Saul, Friedlander ed. *Visions of Apocalypse: End or Reborth?* n.p.: Holmons, 1985.
Schaer, Roland. "Utopia and Twentieth-century Avand-gardes". Trans. Nadia Benhabid. *The Search for the Ideal Society in the Western World.* Ed. Roland Schaer, Gregory Claeys, and Lyman Tower Sargent. New York: The New York Public Library/Oxford UP, 2000. 278-97.
Schattschneider, Doris. *Visions of Symmetry.* New York: W. H. Freeman, 1990.
Schirokauer, Conrad. *A Brief History of Chinese and Japanese Civilization.* 2nd ed. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers, 1989.
Schlant, Ernestine, and J. Thomas Rimer, eds. *Legacies and Ambiguities: Postwar Fiction and Culture in West Germany and Japan.* Washington, D.C.: The Woodrow Wilson Centre Press, 1991.
Schumacher, E. F. *Small is Beautiful: A Study of Economics as if People Mattered.* 1973. London: Blond & Briggs, 1976.
Seeley, Christopher. *A History of Writing in Japan.* Honolulu: U of Hawai'i P, 1991.
Selden, Raman. *Practising Theory and Reading Literature: An Introduction.* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989.
Shippey, Tom, ed. *Fictional Space: Essays on Contemporary Science Fiction.* Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1991.
Shklar, Judith N. *After Utopia: The Decline of Political Faith.* Princeton UP, 1957.
---. "What is the Use of Utopia?" Siebers 40-57.
Sibley, D. *Geographies of Exclusion.* London: Routledge, 1995.
Siebers, Tobin. "Introduction: What Does Postmodernism Want? Utopia". *Heterotopia: Postmodern Utopia and the Body Politic.* Ed. Tobin Siebers. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1994. 1-39.
Simel, Georg. "The Berlin Trade Exhibition". Highmore 298-300.
Singh, Gurbhagat. "Futuristic Directions for Comparative Literauture". *Powers of Narration* 309-317.
Sisk, David. *Transformation of Language in Modern Dystopias.* Westport: Greenwood P, 1988.
Skinner, B. F. *Beyond Freedom and Dignity.* London: Jonathan Cape, 1972.
Smith, Edmund, ed. *Postmodernism and Contemporary Fiction.* N.p.: Batsford, 1991.
Solomon, M. "Marx and Bloch: Reflections on Utopia and Art". *Telos* 13 (Fall 1972): 68-85.
Spector, Jack K. *Surrealism Art and Writing, 1919-1939: The Gold Time.* Cambridge, Cambridge UP, 1997.
Stevenson, Randall. "Postmodernism and Contemporary Fiction in Britain". *Postmodernism and Contemporary Fiction.* Ed. Edmund Smyth. London: Batsford, 1991.
---. *Modernist Fiction: An Introduction.* Revised Edition. London: Prentice Hall, 1992.
---. "Greenwich Meanings: Clocks and Things in Modernist and Postmodernist Fiction". *The Yearbook of English Studies* 30 (2000): 124-136.
Stoekl, Allan. "Reading Avant-Garde Utopias". *Politics, Writing, Mutilation: The Cases of Bataille, Blanchot, Roussel, Leiris, and Ponge.* Minneapolis: U of

Minnesota P, 1985. 124-131, 143-144.
Suleiman, Susan Rubin. "The Fate of the Surrealist Imagination in the Society of the Spectacle". *Fish and the Mirror: Essays on the Art of Angela Carter*. Ed. Lorna Sage. London: Virgo, 1994.
Suvin, Darko. *Metamorphoses of Science Fiction: On the Poetics and History of a Literary Genre*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1979.
---. "Utopianism from Orientation to Agency: What are We Intellectuals under Post-Fordism to Do?" *Utopian Studies* 9.2 (1998): 189-192.
Takayanagi, Shunichi. *Yutopiagaku kotohajime*. (*Introduction to the study of Utopianism.*) Tokyo: Fukutake, 1983.
Tanaka, Akira. "Meiji zenhan-ki no rekishi henkan". In *Rekishi ninshiki*. Ed. Akira Tanaka and Masato Miyachi. Tokyo: Iwanami, 1991. 482-509.
Thiher, Alan. *Words in Reflection: Modern Language, Theory and Postmodern Fiction.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1984.
Thody, Philip. Twentieth-century Literature: Critical Issues and Themes. London: Macmillan, 1996.
Thomas, Julia Adeney. "Global Culture in Question: Contemporary Japanese Photography in America". Befu 131-149.
Thompson, E. P. *Customs in Common.* 1991. London: Penguin, 1993.
Tillich, Paul. "Critique and Justification of Utopia". Manuel 296-309. *Transformations of Utopia: Changing Views of the Perfect Society.* Ed. George Slusser,
Tipton, Elise K, ed. *Society and the State in Interwar Japan.* London: Nissan Institute/Routledge, 1997.
Tobin, Joseph J. *Re-Made in Japan: Everyday Life and Consumer Taste in a Changing Society.* New Haven: Yale UP, 1992.
Todd, I, and M. Wheeler. *Utopia.* London: Orbis, 1978.
Treat, John Whittier. *Writing Ground Zero: Japanese Literature and the Atomic Bomb.* Chicago: Chicago UP, 1995.
Tsuzuki, Chushichi. *The Pursuit of Power in Modern Japan 1825-1995.* Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.
Vlastos, Stephen, ed. *Mirror of Modernity: Invented Traditions of Modern Japan.* Berkeley: U of California P, 1998.
Viera, Gregory C. "No Place for Utopia: Postmodern Theory and *The White Hotel*". *Utopian Studies* 4.2 (1993): 117-27.
Von Boeckmann, Staci L. "Marxism, Morality, and the Politics of Desire: Utopianism in Fredric Jameson's *The Political Unconscious*". *Utopian Studies* 9.2 (1998): 31-50.
Wager, W. Warren. "Forum—On the Role of Utopias in Imagining the Future: The Relevance of Utopian Studies to Future Studies". *Alternative Futures* 1.2 (Summer 1978): 93-94.
---. "The Steel-Grey Saviour: Technocracy as Utopia and Ideology". *Alternative Futures* 2.2 (Spring 1979): 38-54.
Wei-hsu Fu, Charles, and Steven Heine, ed. *Japan in Traditional and Postmodern Perspectives.* New York: State University of New York P, 1995.
Wallek, René. *Concepts of Criticism.* Edited and with an Introduction by Stephen G. Nicholars, Jr. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1963.
Wallerstein, Immanuel. *The Politics of the World Economy.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
---. *Utopistics.* New York: New York Press, 1998.
Walsh, Chad. *From Utopia to Nightmare.* New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
Washburn, Dennis C. *The Dilemma of the Modern in Japanese Fiction.* New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1995.
Weaver, Jack W. *Joyce's Music and Noise: Theme and Variation in His Writings.*

Gainesville: UP of Florida, 1998.
Waugh, Patricia, ed. *Postmodernism: A Reader.* London: Edward Arnold, 1992.
Wegner, Philip Edward. *Horizons of Future Worlds, Borders of Present Sates: Utopian Narratives, History and the Nation.* Ann Arbor: UMI, 1994.
---. "Horizons, Figures, and Machines: The Dialectic of Utopia in the Work of Fredric Jameson". *Utopian Studies* 9.2 (1998): 35-51.
Wells, H. G. *A Short History of the World.* 1922. London: Penguin, 1962.
Wertsch, James V. *Voice of Collective Remembering.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
Wheale, Nigel. *The Postmodern Arts: An Introductory Reader.* London and New York: Routledge, 1995.
White, Hayden. "The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality". *On Narrative.* 1-23.
---. "The Narrativization of Real Events". *On Narrative.* 249-54.
Whorf, Benjamin L. *Language, Thought and Reality.* Ed. John B. Carroll. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1956.
Wiemer, Annegret. "Utopia and Science Fiction: A Contribution to Their Generic Description". *Canadian Review of Comparative Literature* 19.1-2 (March- June 1992): 171-200.
Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society.* London: Chatto & Windus, 1958.
---. *Problems in Materialism and Culture.* London: Verso, 1980.
---. *Towards 2000.* London: Chatto & Windus, 1983.
---. *Resources of Hope.* Ed. Robin Gable. London: Verso, 1989.
Williams, David. *Japan: Beyond the End of History.* London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
---. *Japan and the Enemies of Open Political Science.* London and New York: Routledge, 1996.
Willis, Paul E. *Profane Culture.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.
Wilson, George M. *Patriots and Redeemers in Japan: Motives in the Meiji Restoration.* Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.
Wright, Dale S. "Tradition Beyond Modernity: Nishitani's Response to the Twentieth Century." Wei-hsu Fu and Heine 283-296.
Wright, Patrick. *On Living in an Old Country.* London: Verso, 1985.
Yamamoto, Yoshinobu, ed. *Globalism, Regionalism and Nationalism: Asia in Search of Its Role in the 21st Century.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
Yamanouchi, Hisaaki. *The Search for Authenticity in Modern Japanese Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1978.
Vlastos, Stephen. *Mirror of Modernity: Invented Traditions of Modern Japan.* Barkeley: U of California P, 1998.
Zamyatin, Yevgeny. *We.* New York: The Viking P, 1972.
Zizek, Slavoj. *The Sublime Object of Ideology.* New York: Verso, 1989.
---. *Welcome to the Desert of the Real.* London: Verso, 2002.

Secondary Works on George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

Alldritt, Keith. *The Making of George Orwell.* London: Edward Arnold, 1969.
Beauchamp, Gorman. "Of Man's Last Disobedience: Zamiatin's *We* and Orwell's *1984*". Oldsey and Browne 66-80.
Beauchamp, Gorman. "Of Man's Last Disobedience: Zamiatin's *We* and Orwell's *1984*. *Critical Essays on George Orwell.* Ed. Bernard Oldsey and Joseph Browne. Boston: G. K. Hall, 1986.
Bergonzi, Bernard. "*Nineteen Eighty-Four* and the Literary Imagination". *Dutch Quarterly Review of Anglo-American Letters* 15.3 (1985): 211-228.
Bloom, Harold, ed. *George Orwell's* 1984. New York: Chelsea House, 1987.

Bobbio, N. "The Upturned Utopia". *New Left Review* 177 (1989): 37.
Brown, G. E. *Brodie's Notes on George Orwell's* Nineteen Eighty-Four. London: Macmillan, 1990.
Browning, Gordon. "Toward a Set of Standards for Everlasting Anti-Utopian Fiction". *Cithara* 10 (Dec. 1970): 18-32.
Browning, Gordon. "Toward a Set of Standards for Everlasting Anti-Utopian Fiction". *Cithara* 10 (December 1970): 18-32.
Calder-Marshall, Arthur. "The Case of Comrade Orwell and Mr Blair". *Reynold's News* 12 (June 1949): 4.
Chilton, Paul. "Orwell's Conception of Language". Suykerbuyk 99-110.
Connors, James. "'Do it to Julia': Thoughts on Orwell's *1984*". *Modern Fiction Studies* 16 (1970): 463-73.
Crick, Bernard. *George Orwell: A Life*. 1980; London: Penguin, 1982.
Crick, Bernard.
---. "The Reception of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*". (1985)
Currie, Robert. "The 'Big Truth' in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*". *Essays in Criticism* 34.1 (Jan. 1984): 56-69.
Deutscher, Issac. "*1984*—The Mysticism of Cruelty". Williams 119-132.
Fink, Howard. "Newspeak: The Epitome of Parody Techniques in *1984*". *Critical Survey* 5 (1971): 155-163.
---. "Orwell versus Koestler: *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as Optimistic Satire". Wemyss and Ugrinsky 101-9.
Freedom, Carl. *George Orwell: A Study in Ideology and Literary Form*. London: Garland, 1988.
Fromm, Erich. "Afterword on *1984*". Howe 204-10.
Fromm, Erich. "Afterword on *1984*". *Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Ed. Irving Howe. New York: Harcourt, 1963. 204-10.
Harris, Roy. "The Misunderstanding of Newspeak." Bloom 87-93.
Hitchens, Christopher. *Orwell's Victory*. 2002. London: Penguin, 2003.
Hodge, Bob, and Roger Fowler. "Orwellian Linguistics". Fowler 6-25.
Howe, Irving. *Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four*. New York: Harcourt, 1963.
Ingle, Stephen. *George Orwell: A Political Life*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1993.
Jensen, Ejner J., ed. *The Future of* Nineteen Eighty-Four. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1984.
Kearse, Lee Andrew Jr. *George Orwell: Romantic Utopian*. Ann Arbor: U Microfilms International, 1986.
Kerr, Douglas. *Gray Orwell*. London: Northcote House, 2003.
Lee, Robert A. *Orwell's Fiction*. Notre Dame: U of Notre Dame P, 1969.
Matthews, Kenneth. "'Guardian of the Human Spirit' : The Moral Foundation of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*". *Christianity and Literature* 40 (Winter 1991): 157-167.
Meyers, Jeffrey. *A Reader's Guide to George Orwell*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1975.
Meyers, Valerie. *George Orwell*. London: Macmillan, 1991.
Misawa, Yoshiko. *The Study of George Orwell*. Tokyo: Ochanomizu-shobo, 1977.
New, Melvyn. "Ad Nauseam: A Satiric Device in Huxley, Orwell and Waugh". *Satire Newsletter* 8 (Fall 1970): 24-8.
Oldsey, Bernard and Joseph Browne, eds. *Critical Essays on George Orwell*. Boston: G.K.Hall, 1986.
Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. 1949; London: Secker & Warburg, 1997.
---. *Decline of the English Murder and Other Essays*. London: Penguin, 1965.
---. *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters*. 4 vols. Ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. 1968; London: Penguin, 1990.
---. *The Complete Works of Geroge Orwell*. Ed. Peter Davison. 20 vols. London: Secker & Warburg, 1997-98.

Patai, Daphne. *The Orwell Mystique: A Study in Male Ideology*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1984.
Pittock, Malcolm. "The Hell of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*". *Essays in Criticism* 157 (April 1997): 143-164.
Plank, Robert. *George Orwell's Guide through Hell: A Psychological Study of* 1984. San Bernardino: The Borgo P, 1986.
Rahv, Philip. "The Unfuture Utopia". Bloom 13-20.
Rai, Alok. *Orwell and the Politics of Despair*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988.
Reilly, Patrick. "*Nineteen Eighty-Four*: The Failure of Humanism". *Critical Quareterly* 24.3 (Autumn 1982): 19-30.
---. *Nineteen Eighty-Four: Past, Present, and Future*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1989.
Reszler, André. "Man as Nostalgia: The Image of the Last Man in Twentieth-Century Postutopian Fiction". Saul 196-215.
Rodden, John. *The Politics of Literary Reputation: The Making and Claiming of "St. George" Orwell*. New York and Oxford : Oxford UP, 1989.
Rose, Jonathan. "The Invisible Sources of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*". *Journal of Popular Culture* 26.1 (Summer 1992): 93-107.
Sanderson, Richard. K. "The Two Narrators and Happy Ending of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*". *Modern Fiction Studies* 34.4 (Winter 1988): 587-95.
Sanderson, Richard K. "The Two Narrators and Happy Ending of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*". *Modern Fiction Studies* 34.4 (Winter 1988): 587-95.
Shelden, Michael. *Orwell: The Authorised Biography*. 1991; London: Minerva, 1992.
Singh, Paras Mani. *George Orwell: As a Political Novelist*. Delhi: Amar Prakashan, 1987.
Stansky, Peter and William Abrahams, eds. *Orwell: The Transformation*. London: Constable, 1979.
Steinhoff, William R. "Afterword: The Inner Heart". Jensen 201-208.
Suykerbuyk, Benoit J., ed. *Essays from Oceania and Eurasia: George Orwell and 1984*. Antwerpen: U Instelling Antwerpen, 1984.
Warburg, Fredric. *All Authors are Equal*. London: Hutchinson, 1973.
Wemyss, Courtney T, and Alexej Ugrinsky, eds. *George Orwell*. Westport: Greenwood, 1987.
Williams, Raymond, ed. *George Orwell*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
Winter, Frank. "Was Orwell a Secret Optimist? The Narrative Function of the 'Appendix" to *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." Suykerbuyk 79-89.
Woodcock, George. *The Crystal Spirit: A Study of George Orwell*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1966.
Wykes, David. *A Preface to Orwell*. London: Longman, 1987.

Secondary Works on Anthony Burgess's *A Clockwork Orange*

Aggeler, Geoffrey. *Anthony Burgess: The Artist as Novelist*. Alabama: U of Alabama P, 1979.
Burgess, Anthony. *A Clockwork Orange*. 1962.
---. "The Writer and Music". *Listener* 3 May 1962: 761-2.
---. "The Corruption of the Exotic". *Listener* 26 Feb. 1963: 465-7.
---. *The Novel Now: A Student's Guide to Contemporary Fiction*. 1967. London: Faber and Faber, 1971.
---. *Urgent Copy: Literary Studies*. London, Cape and New York, Norton, 1968.
---. "Clockwork Marmalade". *Listener* 17 Feb. 1972: 197-99.
---. *English Literature: A Survey for Students*. 1958. London: Longman, 1974.
---. *1985*. 1978. London: Arrow Books, 1980.
---. *A Clockwork Orange: A Play with Music Based on His Novella of the Same Name*. London: Hutchinson, 1987.

---. *A Clockwork Orange 2004.* 1987. London: Arrow, 1990.
Ciment, Michel. *Kubrick: The Definitive Edition.* Trans. Gilbert Adair. New York: Faber and Faber, 1999.
Daniels, Don. "A Clockwork Orange". *Sight and Sound* 42.1 (Winter 1972-3): 44-46.
Dix, Carol M. *Anthony Burgess.* Longman: London, 1971. (Published for the British Council)
Hughes, Robert. "The Décor of Tomorrow's Hell". *Time* (December 27th, 1971)
Kubrick, Stanely. *Stanley Kubrick's A Clockwork Orange: Based on the Novel by Anthony Burgess.* 1972. London: Lorrimer Publishing, 2000.
Mathews, Richard. *The Clockwork Universe of Anthony Burgess.* San Bernardino, C.A.: The Borgo Press, 1978.
Saunders, Trevor J. "Plato's Clockwork Orange". *Durham University Journal* 68.2 (June 1976): 113-7.
Stinson, John. *Anthony Burgess Revisited.* Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1991.
Walker, Alexander. *Stanely Kubrick Director.* New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999.

Secondary Works on Alasdair Gray's *Lanark*

Costa, Dominique. "Decadence and Apocalypse in Gray's Glasgow—*Lanark*: A Postmodern Novel". *Scotia* 18 (1994): 22-34.
Craig, Cairns. "Going Down to Hell is Easy: *Lanark*, Realism and The Limits of the Imagination". Crawford and Nairn 90-107.
Crawford, Robert and Thom Nairn, ed. *The Arts of Alasdair Gray.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1991.
Gifford, Douglas. "Recent Fiction: 'Lanark' Towers above All else". *Books in Scotland* 9 (Winter 1981-82): 10-13.
---. "Scottish Fiction 1980-81: The Importance of Alisdair [sic] Gray's *Lanark*". *Scottish Literature* 18 (1983): 210-252.
Gifford, Douglas and Neil McMillan. "Scottish Literature and the Challenge of Theory". *Teaching Scottish Literature.* Ed. Alan MacGillivray. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1997. 3-24.
Harvie, Christopher. "Alasdair Gray and the Condition of Scotland Question". Crawford 76-89.
Morgan, Edwin. "Gray and Glasgow". Crawford and Nairn 64-75.
Murray, Isobel and Bob Tait. *Ten Modern Scottish Novels.* Aberdeen: Aberdeen UP, 1984.
Stevenson, Randall. "Alasdair Gray and the Postmodern". Crawford and Nairn 48-63.
Todd, Richard. "The Intrusive Author in British Postmodern Fiction: The Cases of Alasdair Gray and Martin Amis". Calinescu, 123-37.
Witschi, Beat. *Glasgow Urban Writing and Postmodernism.* Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1989.
---. "Defining a Scottish Identity". *Books in Scotland* 34 (1990): 5-6.

Secondary Works on Abe Kobo's *Inter Ice Age 4*

Abe Kobo. "'Jikan ryoko' no yume". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 8. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 238.
---. "Stori toiu wana". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 8. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 141-7.
---. "Sabaku no shiso". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 8. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 108-114.
---. "Ningen miraishikan josetsu". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 8. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 327-
---. "Mirai towa". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 11. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 496-8.
---. "Sakusha to sakuhin tono kankei". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 19. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 21-22.

---. "SF no tanoshisa—Komatshu Sakyo cho *Fukkatsu no hi*". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 19. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 23.
---. "Dai-yon kanpyo-ki: shinario". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 19. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 275-318.
---. "Watashi no bungaku wo kataru". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 22. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 43-50.
---. "Uchinaru henkyo". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 22. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 205-28.
---. "Tsuki to bouken, kagaku, soshiki". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 22. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 319-23.
---. "Zoku uchinaru henkyo". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 22. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 325-47.
---. "Nenashigusa no bungaku". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 22. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 349-52.
---. "Kokkyo towa nani ka". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 22. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 449-52.
---. *Inter Ice Age 4.* (*Dai Yon Kanpyo-ki.*) Trans. E. Dale Saunders. 1970. Tokyo: Tuttle, 1989.
---. "Toi to Kotae no aida". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 22. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 402-6.
---. "Dento to Henyo". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 27. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 144-51.
---. "Shini isogu kujira tachi". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 27. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 185-7.
---. "Kakujidai no hakobune". (Interview with Tsukushi Tetsuya) Vol. 27. 240-45.
---. "Oe Kenzaburo tono Taidan". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 29. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 72-79.
---. "Abe Kobo-shi kataru". *Abe Kobo zenshu.* Vol. 29. Tokyo: Shincho, 1997. 194-8.
Abe Kobo and Oe Kenzaburo. Ed. Society of Japanese Literature Studies (Nihon bungaku kenkyu shiryo kanko kai). 1974. Tokyo: Yuseido, 1986.
Cecchi, Annie. "Abe Kobo—Sosa, tankyu no monogatari". *Shincho* 87.1 (January 1991): 230-35.
Iijima, Koichi. "Abe Kobo—aruiwa muzai no bungaku". *Hihyo* (April 1959). 4-15.
Ishizaki, Hitoshi. "Kangaru noto: noto" *Kokubungaku: kaishaku to kyozai no kenkyu.* 42.9 (August 1997). 80-85.
Isoda, Koichi. "Mukokusekisha no shiten" *Abe Kobo and Oe Kenzaburo* 30-9.
Keene, Donald. "Honmono no tensai Abe Kobo". *Chuokoron* 108.5 (April 1993) 298-304.
Kikuchi, Shoichi. "Tomei to Hisho: Abe Kobo no Sekai". *Shin Nihonbungaku* 52.8 (October 1997) 78-89.
Lidin, Olof. "Abe Kobo no kokusaishugi". *Shincho* 85.3 (March 1998) : 154-161.
Li, Dechun. "Naibu seishin no shinso kaihatsu". Trans. Nensei Go. *Subaru* 13.10 (October 1991): 228-237.
Lidin, Olof. G. "Abe Kobo no kokusaishugi". *Shincho* 85.3 (March 1988): 154-61.
Matsumoto Tsuruo. "Abe Kobo". *Abe Kobo and Oe Kenzaburo* 83-97.
Melanowicz, Mikołaj. "Abe Kobo: yanda bunmei no aregori to anchiyuutopia". *Kokubungaku: kaishaku to kyozai no kenkyu* 42.9 (August 1998) 8-11.
Morikawa, Tatsuya. "Abe Kobo to avangarudo". ("Abe Kobo and *Avent-garde*".) *Abe Kobo and Oe Kenzaburo* 70-75.
Motoyama, Mutsuko. "The Literature and Politics of Abe Kobo". *Monementa Nipponica* 50.3 (Autumn 1995): 305-23.
Numano, Mitsuyoshi. "Sekai no naka no Abe Kobo". *Kokubungaku: kaishaku to kyozai no kenkyu.* 42.9 (August 1997) 12-18.
Oe, Kenzaburo. "Makura na uchuuwo tobu issatsu no shomotu" (Interview with Tsujii Takashi) *Shincho* 90.4 (April 1993) 62-77.
Osada, Hiroshi. "Abe Kobo wo yomu". *Abe Kobo and OeKenzaburo* 76-82.
Rizawa, Yukio. "Kyosuu no ronri—Abe Kobo ron". *Abe Kobo and Oe Kenzaburo* 98-111.
Saeki, Shoichi. "Abe Kobo—Sono souzoryoku no genshitsu". *Abe Kobo and Oe Kenzaburo* 112-121.
Sasaki, Kiichi. "Dasshutsu to chokoku". *Abe Kobo and Oe Kenzaburo* 16-21.
Shields, Nancy K. "Abe Kobo no gikyoku". *Kokubungaku: kaishaku to kyozai no kenkyu*

42.9 (August 1997): 94-101.
Shindo Masahiro. "*Hakootoko* no guui". *Kokubungaku: kaishaku to kyozai no kenkyu.* 42.9 (August 1997) 61-5.
Takachi, Jun'ichiro. "Deconstructionism and the Contemporary Japanese Literary Theories: Novels of Kobo Abe and Kenzaburo Oe and Their Determination". *Powers of Narration* Ed. Gerald Gillespie and André Lorant. Tokyo: U of Tokyo P, 1995.
Takayama, Tetsuo. "Abe Kobo ron". *Kokubungaku: kaishaku to kyozai no kenkyu* 122-130.
Watanabe, Hiroshi. "Avangarudo no meiro: Abe Kobo ron" *Kokubungaku: kaishaku to kyozai no kenkyu* 131-146.
Watanabe, Jun. "Abe Kobo no houhou". *Abe Kobo and Oe Kenzaburo* 40-9.

Secondary Works on Inoue Hisashi's *Kirikirijin* (1981)

Cohn, Joel R. *Studies in the Comic Spirit in Modern Japanese Fiction.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center, 1998.
Date, Isamu. "Modern Utopian Literature in Japan (1): 'Kirikiri-jin' by H. Inoue". *The Matsuyama University of Commerce Review* 39.2 (June 1988): 253-280.
Inoue, Hisashi. *Kirikirijin.* 1977. Tokyo: Shincho-sha, 1978.
Imamura, Tadazumi. "Inoue Hisashi". *Kokubungaku: kaishaku to kyozai no kenkyu.* 27.11 (August 1982): 126-7.
---. "Gendai-bungaku wa SF wo mezasu". Interview with Yura Kimiyoshi. *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kyozai no kenkyu* (August 1982): 6-27.
Kurihara, Akira. "Soko to saisei: Aidenchichi seiji". *Yuriika* 20.8 (July 1983): 52-56.
"Magician of Language". *Time* (August 1, 1983). 86.
Matsuda, Osamu. "*Kirikirijin* wo kataru". Interview with Inoue Hisashi, author of *Kirikirijin*. *Kokubungaku: Kaishaku to kansho* 49.10 (August 1984): 10-28.
Yamada, Yusaku. "Inoue Hisashi: Kirikirijin". *Kokubungaku: kaishaku to kyozai no kenkyu.* 33.4 (March 1988)

Secondary Works on Murakami Haruki's *Hard-boiled Wonderland and the End of the World*

"Ah, So Surreal". *Weekend Australian* 7 July 2001. 20 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
Birnbaum, Alfred. "Murakami Haruki: Oinaru hokotenkan." Trans. Shibata Motoyuki. *Shincho* 87.1 (January 1990): 266-269.
"Books of the Year: Slugs and Speedbumps". *Independent on Sunday* 23 December 2001. 18 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
"Countdown to Bliss". *New Yorker Observer* 28 July 2003. 18 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
"Enigmatic Attraction". *Bangkok Post* 20 September 2003. 22 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
"Etcetera: Why I Love: Haruki Murakami". *Guardian* 22 June 2003. 18 December 2002. <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
Fitri, Emmy. "I am so Indonesian; I have to eat Rice and Chili". *Jakarta Post* 17 Feb. 2002. 22 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
"Focus on Framing of Yesteryear". *Bangkok Post* 11 September 2003. 20 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
Henshall, Ken. "Super Sheep Tale Japan's Answer to Wonderland". *Waikato Times* 3 Feb. 2001. 22 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
Imai, Kiyoto. "*Sekai no owari to hado boirudo wandarando*: 'Nejire' no soshikika".

Genten (July 1989). *Murakami Haruki Studies* : 62-87.
"Independent Writer Nominated". *Independent* 1 May 2001. 18 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
Inoue, Hisashi. "Nazo to hakken". *Shincho* 82.8 (August 1985): 243-45.
Ivy, Marilyn. "Formations of Mass Culture". *Postwar Japan as History*. Berkeley, 1993.
Iwamoto, Yoshio. "A Voice from Postmodern Japan: Haruki Murakami". *World Literature Today* 67.2 (Spring 1993): 295-300.
Kamijo Harushi. Rev. of *Murakami Haruki × 90 nendai*. Ed. Yokoo Kazuhiro. *Shin nihon bungaku* 49.9 Summer and Autumn 1994: 83-5.
Kanno, Akimasa. "Owarikara no messeji". *Gunzo* (August 1991). Rpt. in *Murakami Haruki Studies* : 119-43.
Kato, Norihiro, ed. *Gunzo: Murakami Haruki.* Tokyo: Shogakukan, 1997.
Kawamoto, Saburo. "Murakami Haruki no parareru warudo" *Nami* (June 1985). *Murakami Haruki Studies* : 38-47.
Kimata, Tomohumi, ed. *Murakami Haruki*. Tokyo: Wakakusa shobo, 1998.
"Letters". *AGE* 13 October 2003. 18 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
Loughman, Celeste. "No Place I was Meant to Be: Contemporary Japan in the Short Fiction of Haruki Murakami". *World Literature Today* 71.1 (Winter 1997): 87-94.
Miyakawa Tateo. "Murakami Haruki: Sekai no owari to hadoboirudo Wandarando". *Kokubungaku: kaishaku to kyozai no kenkyu* 33.4 (March 1988): 84-87.
Morton, Leith. "Murakami Haruki". *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Japanese Culture*. Ed. Sandra Buckley. London and New York: Routledge, 2002. 334.
"Mostwanted". *Sunday Herald* 3 June 2001. 18 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
"Ms. Pacman, Lapland and the Writing Life: Diary of a Novelist on the Verge". *Ottawa Citizen* 14 September 2003. 18 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
Murakami, Fuminobu. "Murakami Haruki's Postmodern World". *Japan Forum* 14.1 (2002): 127-41.
Murakami, Haruki. *Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World.* Trans. Alfred Birnbaum. 1981 (?). New York: Vintage International, 1993.
---. "'Monogatari' no tame no boken". Interview with Kawamoto Saburo. *Bungakukai* 39.8 (August 1985): 34-86.
---. "Basho wo toku hanarete—atarashii nihon no bungaku ni tsuite". ["Roll Over Basho: Who Japan Is Reading, and Why".] Interview with J. Mcinerney. *Subaru* 15.3 (March 1993): 198-209.
"My Secret". *Independent* 11 October 2003. 18 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
Oe, Kenzaburo. "Japan's Dual Identity: A Writer's Dilemma". *World Literature Today* 62.3 (Summer 1988): 359-69.
Ota, Reiko. "Murakami Haruki's *Hard-Boiled Wonderland and the End of the World*: The Bridge between 'Watashi' and 'Boku'". *Gakuen* 82.8 (March 1992): 41-50.
"Our Reviewers Pick Their Best Books of the Year". *Evening Standard* 1 December 2003. 20 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
Stalph, Jürgen. "Murakami Haruki in Germany". *Kokubungaku* (March 1995): 164-5.
Strecher, Matthew C. *Hidden Texts and Nostalgic Images: The serious Social Critique of Murakami Haruki.* Diss. University of Washington. Ann Arbor: University of Microfilms, 1995.
---. "Beyond 'Pure' Literature: Mimesis, Formula, and the Postmodern in the Fiction of Murakami Haruki". *Journal of Asian Studies* 57.2 (May 1998): 354-378.
---. "Magical Realism and the Search for Identity in the Fiction of Murakami Haruki".

Journal of Japanese Studies 25.2 (Summer 1999): 263-98.
"Summer Reading: Last-Minute List". *Evening Standard* 11 August 2003. 18 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
"The Front Line: The Tables Turned Japan's most popular living novelist Haruki Murakami Writes about His Characters' Eating Habits in Brilliant Detail. David Pilling Relishes the Change of a Role Reversal". *Financial Times Weekend* 8 February 2003. 20 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
"The Sweet Sorrow". *Philippine Daily Inquirer* 13 December 2003. 20 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
"Three Teenage Girls Imitate Novels Suicide". *Korea Times* 23 May 2003. 22 December 2003 <http://www.dialognewsroom.com>.
Tsuchida, Tomonori. "'Kotsu', aruiwa 'monogatari' no ba". *Jinbun kenkyu* (March 1991). Rpt. in *Murakami Haruki Studies* : 88-118.
Yuri, Sachiko. "Hirogari, fukamaru Haruki gensho". *Asahi Shinbun* 18 February 2003.